[Lear, Henrietta Louisa (Farrer)]

LIFE

OF

ROBERT GRAY

BISHOP OF CAPE TOWN

AND METROPOLITAN OF AFRICA

YALE
MISSIONARY · LIBRARY,
DIVINITY · SCHOOL.

EDITED BY HIS SON

THE REV. CHARLES GRAY, M.A.

VICAR OF HELMSLEY, YORK

WITH PORTRAIT AND MAP

1782

IN TWO VOLUMES

VOL. II.

RIVINGTONS

London, Oxford, and Cambridge

MDCCCLXXVI

CONTENTS OF VOL. II.

CHAPTER VIII.

APRIL, 1861, TO DECEMBER, 1863.

KAFIR INSTITUTION—ZAMBESI MISSION—LETTERS FROM BISHOP GRAY TO HIS SON—OXFORD WORK—WRECK OF THE "BERNICIA"—GOVERNMENT DIFFICULTIES—GREAT FIRE AT BISHOP'S COURT—VISITATION OF CLANWILLIAM, ETC.—DEATH OF BISHOP MACKENZIE—RETURN TO ENGLAND—LETTER TO THE COMMITTEE OF THE CENTRAL AFRICAN MISSION—APPOINTMENT OF BISHOP TOZER AND BISHOP TWELLS—COLENSO CASE—EARLY DIFFICULTIES—PUBLICATION OF BISHOP COLENSO'S COMMENTARY ON THE ROMANS—BISHOP GRAY'S LETTER TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY—MEETING OF ENGLISH BISHOPS—PRESENTMENT OF THE COMMENTARY—PUBLICATION OF COLENSO'S BOOK ON THE PENTATEUCH—QUESTION OF THE BOOKS RAISED IN CONVOCATION—MEETINGS OF THE ENGLISH BISHOPS WITH REFERENCE TO S. P. G.—QUESTION OF INHIBITION—ARCHBISHOP OF YORK'S DECLARATION—SPEECH OF BISHOP WILBERFORCE—UNITED REQUEST OF THE ENGLISH BISHOPS TO BISHOP COLENSO TO RESIGN HIS OFFICE—CONVOCATION—LOWER AND UPPER HOUSE—CONDEMNATION OF BISHOP COLENSO'S WRITINGS BY BOTH—BISHOP GRAY'S RETURN TO AFRICA—ADDRESSES FROM THE CLERGY OF CAPE TOWN AND NATAL—VISITATION TO D'URBAN, ETC.—STATE OF FINANCE IN THE COUNTRY—DEATH OF MR. SCUDAMORE—BISHOP OF NATAL PRESENTED BY HIS CLERGY—ARTICLES OF ACCUSATION—PREPARATIONS FOR TRIAL—LETTERS CONCERNING CUDDESDEN—VISITATION—ARRIVAL OF THE BISHOPS OF GRAHAM'S TOWN AND FREE STATE—OPINION OF THE QUEEN'S ADVOCATE CONCERNING THE TRIAL—CITATION—TRIAL—DR. BLEEK—LETTER OF BISHOP COLENSO—DEAN OF CAPE TOWN'S ARGUMENT—ARCHDEACON MERRIMAN'S ARGUMENT—ARCHDEACON BADNALL'S—LETTER PUT IN BY BISHOP COLENSO—DEAN OF CAPE TOWN UPON IT—BISHOP OF GRAHAM'S TOWN'S OPINION—BISHOP OF THE FREE STATE'S OPINION—JUDGMENT OF THE METROPOLITAN—SEVERAL CHARGES—SUMMING-UP—SENTENCE OF DEPOSITION OF BISHOP COLENSO . . . . . *Page* 1

CHAPTER IX.

DECEMBER, 1863, TO JULY, 1865.

PASTORAL TO THE CHURCH OF NATAL—CORRESPONDENCE WITH DR. WILLIAMSON, ETC.: WITH MR. KEBLE—LETTERS TO HIS SON ON THEOLOGICAL QUESTIONS—CUDDESDEN, ETC.—LINE OF ACTION CONTEMPLATED BY THE BISHOP—LETTERS FROM MR. KEBLE—FORMAL SENTENCE ON DR. COLENSO PASSED—VISITATION OF NATAL—CHARGE DELIVERED AT THE PRIMARY METROPOLITICAL VISITATION—ADDRESS FROM CLERGY—CONFERENCE—DR. DUFF—DEATH OF MRS. ROBERTSON—DR. COLENSO'S APPEAL HEARD BEFORE THE JUDICIAL COMMITTEE—PUBLIC OPINION THEREON—LETTERS—DEATH OF MR. HENRY GRAY—ORDINATION OF THE BISHOP'S SON—CORRESPONDENCE WITH MR. KEBLE: HIS ILLNESS—JUDGMENT ON DR. COLENSO'S APPEAL—VISITATION CHARGE—ACTS AND RESOLUTIONS OF SYNOD—BISHOP GRAY'S REGRET AT HAVING BEEN REPRESENTED BEFORE THE PRIVY COUNCIL—LETTER TO THE ARCHBISHOP—ADVICE TO HIS SON—JUDGMENT OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL IN DR. COLENSO'S CASE—GENERAL FEELING OF THE CHURCH—DR. PUSEY—THE JUDGMENT RECEIVED IN AFRICA—THE BISHOP'S IMPRESSIONS OF IT—LETTERS TO MR. KEBLE, THE BISHOP OF GRAHAM'S TOWN, ETC.—MEETING OF THE CLERGY OF NATAL—RESOLUTIONS PASSED—UPPER HOUSE OF CONVOCATION—BISHOP OF OXFORD'S SPEECH—ADDRESS OF SYMPATHY AND ADMIRATION FOR BISHOP GRAY PASSED—SENT DOWN TO THE LOWER HOUSE: DISCUSSION THERE—LETTERS TO HIS SON ON A CURATE'S DUTIES . *Page* 106

CHAPTER X.

JULY, 1865, TO JUNE, 1867.

VISITATION IN THE KARROO—ADDRESS FROM THE CHURCH PEOPLE IN GEORGE—TRAVELLING ADVENTURES—DEATH OF DR. WILLIAMSON—FAMINE AND DROUGHT IN AFRICA—QUESTIONS OF THE CONFERENCE IN NATAL—BISHOP OF GRAHAM'S TOWN'S REPLY—ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY'S LETTER TO THE DEAN OF MARITZBURG—RETURN OF DR. COLENSO TO NATAL—DISGRACEFUL SCENES—PROTEST OF CHURCHWARDENS—LETTERS PUBLIC AND PRIVATE FROM THE METROPOLITAN TO DR. COLENSO—LETTER FROM THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY TO DR. COLENSO—SENTENCE OF EXCOMMUNICATION—PASTORAL TO THE CLERGY

AND LAITY OF NATAL—REV. F. H. COX PROPOSED AS BISHOP OF NATAL —LAST LETTER TO MR. KEBLE—MR. KEBLE'S DEATH—VISIT TO NAMAQUA LAND—STRANGE CHURCH VIEWS IN ENGLAND—CONVOCATION—DEBATE IN THE UPPER HOUSE ON THE QUESTIONS PROPOSED BY NATAL —BISHOP OF OXFORD—MOTION CARRIED—DEBATE IN THE LOWER HOUSE —ARCHDEACON WORDSWORTH—HOUSE OF LORDS—LETTERS FROM BISHOP GRAY TO HIS SON AND OTHERS—VISITATION—"A STATEMENT"—ELECTION OF REV. W. BUTLER AS BISHOP IN PLACE OF DR. COLENSO—CORRESPONDENCE WITH MR. BUTLER—OPINION OF THE PRIMATE AND BISHOP OF OXFORD ON THE ELECTION—"COLENSO *v.* GLADSTONE AND OTHERS"—JUDGMENT OF THE MASTER OF THE ROLLS—PUBLISHED LETTER OF THE METROPOLITAN UPON THE JUDGMENT—CORRESPONDENCE—HINTS ABOUT PREACHING—COPES IN DURHAM CATHEDRAL—SUMMONS TO THE PAN-ANGLICAN SYNOD—THE BISHOP SAILS FOR ENGLAND, JUNE, 1867 . . . . . *Page* 225

CHAPTER XI.

JULY, 1867, TO OCTOBER, 1868.

LAND AT SOUTHAMPTON—BISHOP OF OXFORD—MANIFOLD ENGAGEMENTS—DEATH OF JUDGE WATERMEYER—"LESSONS"—LONDON CHURCHES—S. P. G. DAY AT SALISBURY—DISCUSSIONS WITH BISHOPS OF SALISBURY AND OXFORD—PRELIMINARY MEETING OF BISHOPS FOR PAN-ANGLICAN SYNOD—MEETING OF COLONIAL BISHOPS—SPECIAL SERVICES AT S. LAWRENCE, JEWRY—MEETING OF ENGLISH AND AFRICAN BISHOPS—DECLARATION CONSIDERED AND ACCEPTED—PAN-ANGLICAN SYNOD—IMPROMPTU DECLARATION OF FIFTY-FIVE BISHOPS ACCEPTING THE SENTENCE ON DR. COLENSO—RESOLUTIONS AND PASTORAL LETTER—CONVERSAZIONE IN S. JAMES'S HALL—CONCLUDING SERVICE—THE "TIMES"—CHURCH CONGRESS AT WOLVERHAMPTON—PRESENTATION OF CROZIER—ELY—MR. BUTLER AS BISHOP-ELECT—CORRESPONDENCE—MR. BUTLER DECIDES NOT TO GO TO NATAL—MEETINGS AT S. P. G.;—S. ANDREW'S, WELLS STREET—CAMBRIDGE—RESUMED LAMBETH CONFERENCE—REPORT OF NATAL COMMITTEE—SEARCH FOR A BISHOP OF NATAL—MR. MACRORIE—OXFORD—DIFFICULTIES ABOUT CONSECRATION—LETTER FROM THE BISHOP OF LONDON: FROM THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK—REPLIES—CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY—CONVOCATION: LOWER HOUSE, UPPER HOUSE—CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE BISHOP OF

Oxford—Visit to Oxford—Round in the North—York—Norwich —Duke of Buckingham's Despatch—Interviews—Sir Roundell Palmer—Despatch withdrawn—Journeys—Cuddesden Festival—Report of the Committee of Convocation—Debate of the Upper House: Lower House—Natal Question in the House of Lords—E. C. U.—Meeting at S. P. G. for Cape Town Association—Question of Mandate—Vexatious Delays—Appointment of Dean of Cape Town to be Bishop of Bombay—Preparations to Depart—Farewell Services at S. Lawrence, Jewry—Interview with Mr. Disraeli—Last Words from Plymouth to Bishop of Oxford

Page 325

CHAPTER XII.

October, 1868, to September, 1872.

Gathering a Sisterhood—Voyage out: Madeira—Beginning of S. George's Home—Rule of Life—Address—Inner Rule—Spiritual Direction—Letters on Spiritual Subjects—Correspondence with Bishop Wilberforce—Consecration of Bishop Macrorie—Synod—Visitation—Forest Fire—Troubles—Church Property in Natal—Framing of Canons—Irish Church—Death of Mrs. Glover—Provincial Synod—Declaration of Fundamental Principles—Constitution—Canons—Severe Illness—Bishop of Zululand—Letters to Miss Mackenzie: to Bishop Wilberforce—Sudden Voyage to England for Mrs. Gray—Dangerous Symptoms—Work in England—Bishopric of Madagascar—Consecration of Bishop Webb—Return to Cape Town—Rough Voyage—Increase of Mrs. Gray's Illness—Calamities of France—Mrs. Gray's Last Illness and Death—Correspondence—Departure of Bishop Cotterill for Edinburgh—Ritualism—Purchas Judgment—Patience and Gentleness needed—S. Thomas, Malmesbury—Bishop's Reply on Ritual Matters—Visitation in Namaqua Land—Consecration of Bishop Merriman—Efforts at Union with the Dutch Church—General Reunion—The Diamond Fields—Grand Duke Alexis—Brotherhoods—Visitation Tour—Athanasian Creed—Proposals to create a See of George—Death of Mr. William Gray—Last Illness—Last Confirmation and Service—Death—Burial . . . . *Page* 444

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX I.—Judgment of the Lords of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council on the Appeal of the Rev. William Long . . . *Page* 577

APPENDIX II.—The Citation of Bishop Colenso . . . 591

APPENDIX III.—The Letter of the Dean and Archdeacons . . 593

APPENDIX IV.—Documents 618

APPENDIX V.—Bishop Colenso's Protest 624

APPENDIX VI.—Bishop Colenso's Letter 625

APPENDIX VII.—Sentence 638

APPENDIX VIII.—Judgment of the Privy Council . . . 641

APPENDIX IX.—Declaration of English Clergy . . . 650

APPENDIX X.—Rules for S. George's Home 652

INDEX 657

ILLUSTRATION—The Graves at Claremont . . *Frontispiece.*

YALE MISSIONARY LIBRARY, DIVINITY SCHOOL.

CHAPTER VIII.

APRIL, 1861, TO DECEMBER, 1863.

KAFFIR INSTITUTION—ZAMBESI MISSION—LETTERS FROM BISHOP GRAY TO HIS SON—OXFORD WORK—WRECK OF THE "BERNICIA"—GOVERNMENT DIFFICULTIES—GREAT FIRE AT BISHOP'S COURT—VISITATION OF CLANWILLIAM, ETC.—DEATH OF BISHOP MACKENZIE—RETURN TO ENGLAND—LETTER TO THE COMMITTEE OF THE CENTRAL AFRICAN MISSION—APPOINTMENT OF BISHOP TOZER AND BISHOP TWELLS—COLENSO CASE—EARLY DIFFICULTIES—PUBLICATION OF BISHOP COLENSO'S COMMENTARY ON THE ROMANS—BISHOP GRAY'S LETTER TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY—MEETING OF ENGLISH BISHOPS—PRESENTMENT OF THE COMMENTARY—PUBLICATION OF COLENSO'S BOOK ON THE PENTATEUCH—QUESTION OF THE BOOKS RAISED IN CONVOCATION—MEETINGS OF THE ENGLISH BISHOPS WITH REFERENCE TO S. P. G.—QUESTION OF INHIBITION—ARCHBISHOP OF YORK'S DECLARATION—SPEECH OF BISHOP WILBERFORCE—UNITED REQUEST OF THE ENGLISH BISHOPS TO BISHOP COLENSO TO RESIGN HIS OFFICE—CONVOCATION—LOWER AND UPPER HOUSE—CONDEMNATION OF BISHOP COLENSO'S WRITINGS BY BOTH—BISHOP GRAY'S RETURN TO AFRICA—ADDRESSES FROM THE CLERGY OF CAPE TOWN AND NATAL—VISITATION TO D'URBAN, ETC.—STATE OF FINANCE IN THE COUNTRY—DEATH OF MR. SCUDAMORE—BISHOP OF NATAL PRESENTED BY HIS CLERGY—ARTICLES OF ACCUSATION—PREPARATIONS FOR TRIAL—LETTERS CONCERNING CUDDESDEN—VISITATION—ARRIVAL OF THE BISHOPS OF GRAHAM'S TOWN AND FREE STATE—OPINION OF THE QUEEN'S ADVOCATE CONCERNING THE TRIAL—CITATION—TRIAL—DR. BLEEK—LETTER OF BISHOP COLENSO—DEAN OF CAPE TOWN'S ARGUMENT—ARCHDEACON MERRIMAN'S ARGUMENT—ARCHDEACON BADNALL'S—LETTER PUT IN BY BISHOP COLENSO—DEAN OF CAPE TOWN UPON IT—BISHOP OF GRAHAM'S TOWN'S OPINION—BISHOP OF THE FREE STATE'S OPINION—JUDGMENT OF THE METROPOLITAN—SEVERAL CHARGES—SUMMING-UP—SENTENCE OF DEPOSITION OF BISHOP COLENSO.

WE must now go back somewhat to take up the other threads of the time in which the Long case was prominent. Among other interests of that period the Kafir Institution is conspicuous; the Bishop was actively engaged in forwarding its work, all the more that just then Mr. and Mrs. Glover were obliged to go to England on account of health; and Miss Ainger, the lady in charge of the Kafir girls, died,

after some prolonged illness. "We have lost our dear patient Miss Ainger," the Bishop wrote. "She is a great loss to our Institution; she was a thorough Christian lady and a very good teacher. I do not know where to look for such another. Twelve more girls came to-day." The Bishop did not like to be away for more than a day or two at this time, wishing to be able to minister to the last to the dying woman.

The Zambesi Mission was also the cause of lively interest to those left behind at Cape Town.

"I received letters from dear Mackenzie yesterday," the Bishop writes (April 12th, 1861). "All the party reached the mouth of the Kongone in safety, and found, to their joy, Livingstone, his brother, and Dr. Kirk there, with sixteen Makololo, all well. We had been in some anxiety about him. He urged them strongly not to go up the Shire on account of the season, but to proceed with him to explore the Rovooma. After a stout resistance from Mackenzie, he carried his point; and the greater portion of the Mission party is now at Joanna, one of the Comoro Islands, and Mackenzie and Rowley have gone with Livingstone up the Rovooma. I think that the decision has been a right one. It is thought by many naval men here that the Rovooma is connected with Lake Nyassa, and perhaps navigable all the way. It has no bar, almost the only river without one; and lies between the Portuguese territory and the dominions of the Imaum of Muscat. Our Government has long been anxious for the survey of that river, and the French have been said to contemplate taking possession of it. This expedition will settle many questions about it, and may prove it to be the best access to the interior for us, and the fittest high road for commerce. Another interesting fact is that Sir H. Currie, whom the Governor has sent up to the country (down which I travelled), between Natal and Kaffraria, has induced the natives to surrender a great portion of it, and to apply to be governed through English Magistrates. It will soon be altogether English territory, as I used to say in my speeches in England. It was one of the fields which I implored might have a Bishop, and for which S. P. G. voted

£300 a year, and for which I engaged Mr. ——, who was got rid of by S. P. G. when I left England. I shall never cease to deplore his not being sent out. . . . Miss Mackenzie is still with us."

Some of the Bishop's letters at this time to his son are too characteristic and too valuable, as the open-hearted manly advice of a father who fully lived up to whatever rules he could offer, to be passed over.

To Charles Norris Gray, Esq.

"April 16th, 1861.

. . . "I should think that a walk somewhere in England during the Long would be pleasant, and a fair relaxation. I do not want you, my dearest boy, to deny yourself any fair amusement or pleasure, or really to scrimp;—but to remember that we are accountable for spending money as well as other things, and to act accordingly."

"May 15th.

. . . "Your last note gave me some additional insight into your course of studies. The prizes, however, seem all to lie in the direction of physics. Only take care that the pewter cup is not followed by the wooden spoon! I shall have to treat your elbowing with more respect when we meet again than when last in London! : . . You do not say what you are reading in the way of theology. You should always have something of this kind on hand. I wish that you would get Wordsworth's Commentary on the New Testament, especially the Acts and Epistles, and read them through. I think an hour a day at it would repay you. Then, if you were to work as you have time at Professor Browne's work on the Articles, you would have a very interesting study. Have you read Pusey's Commentary on Hosea? I have read it through to your sisters, and look anxiously for the other minor Prophets, and, above all, for Isaiah, which has been the study of his life. Do you get in leisure hours any English reading? I should not let any branch of study be neglected. . . . I am surprised at

your difficulty about logic. I was rather fond of it. In my day you might have taken up half-a-dozen books of Euclid instead. . . . I wish that —— did not set up private theatricals;—they are not the thing for a Clergyman's house. Take care of yourself, my dearest boy. 'Keep thyself pure.'—Ever your affectionate Father, R. CAPETOWN."

"September 12th, 1861.

"I suppose that you will have gone up for your examination before this reaches you. I wish I could think that you had been really working through the Long;—but I gather that you have been desultory, and this, according to the opinion of most, seems to be your snare. You do not give yourself to the one work before you thoroughly, but sip, like the butterfly, at a great many flowers. I do hope that, after your examination, you will read a portion of Wordsworth's Greek Testament daily;—it would, I think, give tone to your mind. Religious knowledge cannot be reached by a jump at last, nor the character be formed at once. You are now being formed very largely; you are daily *becoming* what you will for ever *be*. . . . We have had cheering letters lately from Bishop Mackenzie. He was in the Shire, just reaching Murchison's Falls, where he was to disembark and plant his first Mission. The Rovooma was given up for the present, as the season was too far advanced. They are to meet the female part of the expedition at the mouth of the Zambesi, by January 1st. Livingstone will then proceed again up the Rovooma. He and the Bishop get on famously together. The Bishop says they chaff each other all day like two school-boys. They have all had the fever, but are well again. . . . The 'Pioneer' is to be at the Kongone not later than January 1st. We may have some difficulty about getting a ship to meet them. Your mother and I rode down yesterday to see the Admiral about it."

To the Rev. Dr. WILLIAMSON.

"Bishop's Court, July 18th, 1861.

"My dear Richard—Unfortunately the Essays, with many

other books and boxes, were lost in the wreck of the 'Bernicia,' in which poor Mr. Oliff lost wife, wife's father, two children, and withal all his goods. They were wrecked on Robben Island on a Sunday night, having had prayers at seven o'clock. . . . Curiously enough, Oliff saw a few pages of the Essays on the shore the next day. The only piece of property which I have recovered is *The Divine Life in Man*, in a tattered condition, with my name written in the title-page by Annie. Poor Oliff found his head laid, when he reached shore, on a large Bible given him by his scholars when he left, which also was all tattered, and he picked up a photograph of his lost children. One of them, a little chorister of seven, comforted a little girl who was crying (she was saved) by telling her not to mind, 'We shall all be angels singing in Heaven to-night.' . . . We are all well, but worn out with a house scarce ever less than full. Our washerwoman (who was paid £60) has just given up, saying that it is not like a private house. It is indeed a hotel!"

African affairs excited the keenest interest in the Bishop's mind at this time, and he wrote at great length upon them to those in England whom he thought likely to help. The Governor of Natal—Mr. Scott—had been encouraged by the Duke of Newcastle (then Colonial Secretary) to act independently of Sir George Grey, and a complication had ensued through the two Governors acting on a diverse policy, and disturbances were threatening in consequence. Interesting as the Bishop's detailed letters are, the events they narrate have now so much drifted away amid the past, and other more immediately weighty matters taken their place, that it would perhaps scarcely be well to give them here. But it would not be doing justice either to the Bishop's own warm friendship for Sir George Grey, or to the Governor himself, altogether to omit to notice the strong expressions concerning him which continually occur, as the one man in whom Africa had confidence as an administrator of native affairs, and the unbounded regret that, at so critical a moment he should be sent, as was the case, to New Zealand.

The Bishop hoped and believed that Sir George Grey would be sent back with large powers, and expressed his own conviction that nothing but Sir George's plans for a kind of federation of Provinces—between east and west—could meet the many difficulties which had arisen. Various other subjects of interest are alluded to in the following letters.

To Mrs. Williamson.

"October 18th, 1861.

"We are in the midst of picnics. Yesterday we gave one in our grounds to a lady's school, and were forty in number. Next Tuesday we give one up the mountain to the College, and shall be near ninety. Then we are to have all the schoolmasters of the neighbourhood for a day, and are to discuss Sunday and night schools. You would have been interested to have been with us, when two days ago I opened our School Chapel at Constantia. . . . It is a Dutch district, but nothing had been done there before, and all joined in this work. We had five races present, gathered by the Church out of their various nations into the one family of Christ. The Kafirs from Zonnebloem were the choir, and chanted the service very nicely. You would have been struck with their reverent and devout manner. . . . Within a month from the departure of Sir G. Grey, Government writes me word that, owing to the withdrawal from Kaffraria of the Parliamentary grant, they will have to reduce greatly, and probably altogether withdraw, their grant of £1000 a year from my Kafir College. If so, the industrial work must be given up, and two-thirds of the pupils dismissed. . . . We have twenty-one buildings at this moment in hand, or in contemplation. If my life is spared, and S. P. G. won't come forward, I shall have two years hence to go home and plead for Hottentots, to the infinite disgust, I doubt not, of many. But the Clergy cannot leave the work around them untouched, and I cannot restrain them, and this country cannot supply all the means."

To CHARLES NORRIS GRAY, Esq.

"November 18th, 1861.

. . . "You must now chalk out a line for yourself for the remainder of your College career, and keep to it. The books to be read, the time to be given to each, should be fixed. Do not cram, however. But probably you will think I must be very credulous to think that there is a chance of this! Two of the most important years of your life have passed since we met; the next will be still more influential over the future—it is the year which will probably fix you. I am glad to see that you are really working in earnest. What I care for is honest work—not success. Let us do what we can: God does not look for more. . . . I had hoped that we should have some quiet this summer, and time for thought and reading, but I see no chance of it, and I have almost whole charge of Rondebosch parish during Fry's absence."

To EDWARD GRAY, Esq.

"November 19th, 1861.

. . . "I want to go to sleep and let my mind rest, and revel in books. We have been making a vineyard, and planted 10,000 vines. This country is wonderfully suited to the grape. Cuttings not longer than my middle finger, and planted not two months ago, are, in some cases, putting forth bunches of grapes. We keep ten or twelve men always employed in trenching land for cultivation, and we are trying to build houses for the poor. I want to improve this property if I can for my successor, but it is costly work. Matters are all very dull with us. The Bishop of S. Helena, to my great sorrow, goes to Colombo, and Welby succeeds him. I mean to make the Secretary of State apply to me for confirmation as Metropolitan, or else kick up a row. He has no right to ignore the existence of the Province, and set aside the laws and constitutions of the Church. . . . How thankful I should be if I never had another appointment to make, and yet perhaps my greatest battles will one day be about Patronage! I am greatly disappointed at the delay about the Free State Bishopric."

To Charles Norris Gray, Esq.

"Bishop's Court, January 20th, 1862.

"My dearest boy—I am sorry that the mail left without your being able to announce your fate. I fully expect, however, that you will have got through notwithstanding your apprehensions. I think you have worked fairly when you had to face the awful schools. I am for steady, plodding work,—even work,—not a rush at the end. Dear Louisa has come back thin, and not very well,—I do not think either of them improved. . . . You will think I am very vigorous when I tell you that I leave home every Sunday at 9.30, and do not return till 9 P.M., taking two services at Rondebosch, visiting sick, etc.,—thermometer 80, and never tired. We had a dreadful fire last week, which has again burnt 200 acres. Cloete set his veldt on fire without giving me any notice. It has destroyed £4,000 worth of wood. I would not have taken £1,000 for the injury done to this place;—the walks and woods are spoilt for years to come. I rode three horses that day, tiring out two, and was up again, not being able to sleep, between two or three in the morning. Our new Governor has arrived—he seems an amiable man. No news from Bishop Mackenzie. If we go to war with America, our chance of communication with them may be cut off."

To the Same.

"Kalk Bay, February 19th, 1862.

"My dearest boy—It is clear by your own account that you ought to have been plucked! It is lucky that you escaped your deserved fate!! You say that you will do what I wish about Greats and honours. I wish you to do what I advised at first;—to read steadily, not so much with a view to examination as to improvement. I think that every young man is bound to work while he is at college honestly and earnestly at that for which he was sent there. I recommend you to master one after another the books or things which are needful for your passing your examination creditably;—to go on steadily

at this till the period of your examination. If you find that you know enough subjects to justify your going in for honours, go in. If not, be content with having done all that God has given you the power to do. . . . Dear Agnes's [1] death was a great shock to me—I had not the slightest apprehension of it. For her I cannot grieve, but for her poor dear children I do. . . . We are all growing old together, and some drop off before us. I think that I feel the worries of the management of this immense parish more than I did. I am in close communication with 100 men, and everything is referred to me, and it is not pleasant to know all that goes on feebly or amiss, and to have to regulate so complicated a machinery."

To the Same.

"Bishop's Court, April 17th, 1862.

"My dearest boy—Your mother will give you a better account than I can do of our long and hot ride of 500 miles to Clanwilliam, S. Helena, Saldanha Bay, etc., from which we have just returned. . . . Do you make speeches at the debating society? It is well to cultivate early the power of thinking and expressing yourself in public. Much as I have been driven to speak, I have never been able to *think* in public,—in a great measure, I believe, from want of early training. I hope that you keep steadily to reading. In your last you speak of training, but it is for games. The mind is above the body;—the soul above both. The victories of each are important in the same rates as their relative importance to each other."

In a letter of the same date, the Bishop says that his wife was a little fagged with this, their longest and hottest ride, and she was also suffering from the effects of a fall from her horse. "I would give a great deal," he adds, "to be three months in England to look out for men for the Free State." He was to be there sooner than he expected. Almost immediately after this last letter was written, he heard of the death of Bishop Mackenzie, whose sister, with Mrs. Burrup (wife to the Bishop's companion in suffering), had left Bishop's Court in January, in

[1] His sister-in-law, widow of the Rev. Charles Gray.

hopes of joining the Missionaries at Magomero. On April 26th the ladies returned to the kindly shelter, bereaved of brother and husband. The fullest and most intensely interesting details of Bishop Mackenzie's last days are given in his Life (already referred to). Here we must only say that fever seized them both while making for the Ruo mouth, and all their quinine was gone. A journal-like letter of Bishop Mackenzie tells the tale of increasing illness, and of the unfailing strength found in knowing that "He who brought us here can take care of us." It ends with the words "Good-bye for the present." The Bishop became aware of his approaching end, and told his Makololo attendants that Jesus was coming to fetch him away. On January 24th, 1862, he died, Mr. Burrup, who was almost as ill himself, doing what he could to minister to his dying friend. The native chief insisted on immediate burial on the mainland, and the Missionary Bishop was laid to rest under a large tree, his half-fainting friend saying so much as he was able of the burial-service over him in the dim evening light. Mr. Burrup was taken back to Magomero in a state of great exhaustion, and he too died on February 22nd. The ladies arrived, as appointed, at the meeting place, the junction of the Ruo and Shire, and heard the sad tidings, returning, as already stated, to Cape Town at once.

The Metropolitan's letter to the Bishop of Oxford concerning this sad episode is so comprehensive in its information, that it must be given here.

To the BISHOP of OXFORD.

"Bishop's Court, April 29th, 1862.

"My dear Bishop—Alas! alas! sad news from the Zambesi! Our dear brother has fallen. He and his equally devoted priest, Burrup, have been taken from the Church on earth, and the work so successfully begun, to the rest above.

"Livingstone left in the 'Pioneer' on the 15th to meet the 'Lady Nyassa,' his wife, and our second Mission party. The Bishop could not at the moment accompany him, but left on January 3rd, hoping to meet Livingstone at Malo, an island at

the mouth of the Ruo, half-way down the Shire, about eighty miles from the Mission station. They could not procure proper boatmen for the only canoe which they could obtain. It was upset in the night, and they lost their medicines and medical comforts. Burrup and three Makololo accompanied him. Both he and Burrup had been suffering from diarrhœa; at the island fever was soon added. They might have returned, or dropped down the river to Livingstone, who had left the island only a few days before, but they remained, apparently with a view to pave the way for a future Mission to the island. The Bishop gradually sank, and breathed his last on January 31st. Burrup buried him under a tree by the river-side, then turned back to the Mission station. He reached Chibisas partly by canoe and partly on foot, and was carried from thence by the Makololo to the station, where, after a few days, he too died. There is but little doubt that if they had gone forward, or returned home, their lives would have been spared; but neither of them were at all careful about their health. Burrup, you know, had proceeded from Quilimane, with Dickenson and Clarke, up to Titli, in a canoe lent him by the Portuguese, and from there, all alone, up to the Murchison Falls—300 miles altogether—without knowing a word of the language of the country. Livingstone, in a letter, says such a feat had not been performed before.

"You will see in the deeply interesting papers I am sending home the whole history of this Mission, which has begun in so remarkable a manner, and has been founded amid great losses and much misery. I will here only give you a bare outline. Immediately on landing at Chibisas from the 'Pioneer,' they found the country in a state of utter distraction from the inroads of the Ajawa into the Magnana country, on a slave-hunting expedition, in which they destroyed villages, crops, people, etc. The day after they landed they met a party of more than eighty slaves. The Bishop was bathing, but Livingstone took the gun from their driver, and set them all free. During the next few days they met and set free many others, and proceeded against an encampment from which they had been assaulted. Livingstone headed this, and the Bishop, not willing to fire, gave

him his gun. They then settled with a chief, and he told them all other chiefs had fled, and he must fly unless the Bishop would settle at his village. He did so. In a few days various chiefs came to intreat his protection against the Ajawa. He went against one party some miles off, and 400 women and children were thrown upon his hands. Afterwards he went to punish another chief, who had robbed and nearly murdered Proctor and Scudamore, and burned his village.

"The two last acts he details at full length in his Journal, in a letter to his sister, and probably in letters to various others. Evidently Livingstone and the Bishop were both nervous about the view that friends and still more enemies at home will take of their proceedings; but the Bishop, to the last, was quite satisfied in his own mind that he had done right. People will probably come to different conclusions on the subject. I confess I am very doubtful as to the last act. The result, however, so far as we can at present see, has been that peace has been restored to the whole country; that the Ajawa now understand what the Bishop sought to impress upon all their nation with whom he could speak, that he loved them as well as the Magnana, and only desired to see them living together in peace, and not destroying each other by selling all they could seize for slaves. The letter of Dr. Meller, Livingstone's naturalist, which I send to the committee, gives the best account of the difficulties in which the Bishop was placed by the solicitations of all the surrounding chiefs, and the assurance that his presence in their respective villages would prevent the Ajawa from attacking them. . . . Livingstone thinks that the Mission should have confined itself to the defensive; but it is clear that he began the aggressive system, though the Mission may have carried it too far. It is curious that the question of using arms was freely discussed in my house, and that the party—the Bishop and Scudamore most especially—maintained that it was unlawful under *any* circumstances, even in defence of their lives; that their line was patient suffering.

"The Bishop's Journal and his last letter to his sister are full of interest. A few days before his death, he says—'I read

Burrup this morning the Keble for 25th Sunday after Trinity. I do so admire the last verses.' He did not then know how applicable they were to his own circumstances. His last recorded words are, 'Burrup is very low, and we have no medicine: of quinine, which we ought to be taking every day, there is none. But He who brought us here can take care of us without human means. If we should be both down at once, Charlie (the Makololo) will take care of us. The texts in Greek, which we have learned day by day, lately have been Rom. ii. 28, 29, "He is not a Jew;" Rom. iii. 21, "But now the righteousness of God, etc.;" vi. 2, 3, "The wages of sin is death;" vii. 24, 25, "O wretched man;" viii. 38, 39, "We are persuaded that neither life nor death," etc. Good-bye for the present.'

"One could scarce wish for more. Blessed words and truths to be last imprinted on the heart and mind of the dying servant of the Lord. . . . I preach on this sad event on Sunday. But now for the future. I have been hesitating what to do. Some think that I might go to the Mission, but it is quite uncertain *when* I could get there, and almost certain that I could not get away perhaps for a year or two. Others and more thoughtful men think that I should go at once to England to confer and cooperate with the committee in the steps which must immediately be taken. The difficulties about men for the Free State, which is being lost to us, and occupied by the Wesleyans through our delay; the case of the Bishop of Natal, who is on his way home; my own appeal to the Privy Council—all would make me concur in this view, if it were not that I ought to visit my whole Province this year, and that the twenty-five men whom I brought out last year are not thoroughly settled in their places, and give a great deal of trouble, and cause a correspondence which no one but myself can settle. I therefore am disposed not to go. These points seem to me to be of great importance.

"1. It is essential that a new head be sent out immediately. If one is not on the spot by January 1st, it is feared that the Mission will break up. The officers who went up,

Captain Wilson and Dr. Ramsay and Dr. Meller, all urge the importance of immediate action. . . . Waller urgently pressed to come down to represent to me and to you in England the absolute necessity of a steamboat, and better communication. . . Everybody loved the Bishop. Not a man came across him who did not fall under the influence of his loving spirit. Alas! alas! that he and others of them have been such spendthrifts of their health.

"The Bishop must be consecrated in England, unless he could come out here before Welby leaves the Cape for S. Helena. Any one that you or your committee select I at least shall gladly welcome.

II. As to a better system of communication: Not one-third, I understand, of the goods taken up by the Bishop with him, or forwarded by me at his request, to the mouth of the Kongone, have reached the station. . . . The consequence is that the Mission has lived largely on native food, has been without the essentials of wine and brandy, and has suffered much from diarrhœa. They have also been almost out of calico, which is their money, and without which they cannot live. The question therefore arises, as to what we can do to remedy this. Livingstone urges me to push my original plan of a steamboat. The Missionaries re-echo his advice, and say that it is essential. . . . The Bishop spoke strongly in his last writings about a steamboat, and has left behind him a rough draft in pencil of an appeal to the University Boat Club to provide one." [Here the Metropolitan goes into the *pros* and *cons.* concerning this point, and the establishment of an agency by means of which goods might be sent up to the Mission.]

"Another subject for consideration is, whether anything can or ought to be done politically? It is quite clear that the ten guns in possession of the Mission have for the time, and perhaps permanently, settled the country, checked the slave-trade, and given a turn to public opinion among the heathen. Whether this will last, whether the pro-slavery party will be driven to combine against the Mission, I know not. . . . It is certain that the Portuguese are the chief instigators of the slave-trade. They are the merchants who carry it on. The

Governor of Mozambique is not known to be implicated in it, and he has done a great deal for the country. . . . The going up of two boats of a man-of-war with Miss Mackenzie and Mrs. Burrup to the very foot of the Murchison's Falls cannot but have a salutary effect both upon Portuguese and heathen. It shows them that they are not beyond the reach of British power. The gallant Captain Wilson (a very fine fellow, to whom we are all much indebted) told them that if they troubled the Mission, a body of men would come up from a man-of-war to punish them. It is a question whether the slave-trade may not be more effectually crushed by fifty marines from a man-of-war on Mount Zamba near to which the land between the fresh-water Lake Nyassa and the salt-water Shirwa is only five miles broad, than by all our ships on an unhealthy coast. . .

"The Portuguese endeavoured, at Du Prat's instigation, to obtain from the Imaum of Muscat at Zanzibar the gift of the coast of the mouth of the Rovooma. We were only just in time to stop him. It is high time to let Portugal know that all this encouragement of the slave-trade (for the river was wanted purely for this purpose) will not be tolerated. Livingstone is more discouraged by finding them tracking his steps with their slave-dealers, up the banks of Nyassa, than by anything that has happened to him in Africa. . . .

"May 10th.—Since writing the above, I have resolved to break through all difficulties, and go home. I trust to sail by this mail. I cannot be absent long. I need not say I shall find you out as soon as possible. Ever affectionately yours,

"R. CAPETOWN."

Feeling, as the above letter shows, the importance of his presence in England to seek a successor to Bishop Mackenzie, the Metropolitan did not delay, but sailed at once for England, where, as mentioned before, he and Mrs. Gray arrived June 26th, 1862.

The Bishop's published letter to those who were interested in the Central African Mission expresses his earnest feeling and anxiety—

"My dear Brethren—I venture to lay before you the reasons which have brought me suddenly and unexpectedly to England, and the objects which I seek to accomplish during my short stay in this country.

"The news of the death of dear Bishop Mackenzie and his brave fellow-labourer, the Rev. H. Burrup, filled the hearts of all Christian men at the Cape, as it will do in England, with the deepest sorrow. It was brought to us by H.M.S. 'Gorgon,' the officers of which had conveyed the wife and sister of those who had fallen, in their boats, to the Mission station, and from thence to the Cape. They were the bearers also of very touching letters from the bereaved Mission party and from Dr. Livingstone. These all, with one voice, urged upon me the necessity of immediate action, and expressed a belief that the existence of the Mission might be endangered by delay. Had it been possible, I should have proceeded myself at once to aid our brethren in the trying and difficult position in which they were placed; but there was no ship by which I could hope to proceed there, and I could not have reckoned upon returning, if life were spared, within two years, which would have caused an absence greatly injurious to my Diocese. The opinion also of those with whom I took counsel was, that, looking at the difficulties connected with the consecration of another Bishop, the dangers which at this time surround the Mission, and the risk of delay in sending out another leader, I should do much good by returning at once to England to take counsel with the Committee, and aid in finding and in consecrating a worthy successor to him who has been taken from us; and that it was my duty to do so."

The Bishop goes on to put forth the other objects which he also had in view, among which the appointment of a Bishop to the Free State was foremost. "That large territory, with the country of the great Chief Moshesh, constituted originally while belonging to the British Crown, a portion of my Diocese. When the Sees of Graham's Town and Natal were founded, it was already decided to abandon the country, and it was therefore not included in any of the three Dioceses. It is now a

Dutch republic. In all the villages there is an English population, and there are perhaps 200,000 native heathen. It is now full three years since the S. P. G. voted an income for a Bishop, but no Bishop has been appointed. I may not quit England till one has been consecrated." The Bishop then speaks of his Kafir College Mission work among the Hottentots, and some of his other works, begun or to be undertaken;—the English College and Orphan Home, already existing, a Training School, so greatly needed, and the fact that "the time is fast approaching when we must begin to contemplate the erection of at least a portion of a Cathedral."

The result of this was the appointment of the Rev. W. G. Tozer, of S. John's College, Oxford, then Vicar of Burgh-with-Winthorpe, Lincolnshire, to succeed Bishop Mackenzie; and the Rev. Edward Twells, of S. Peter's College, Cambridge, Incumbent of S. John's, Hammersmith, to the Bishopric of the Orange River Free State Territory; and the two Missionary Bishops were accordingly consecrated in Westminster Abbey on the Feast of the Purification, February 2nd, 1863, by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Metropolitan of Africa, and the Bishop of Oxford, assisted by the Bishops of Lincoln and Montreal.[1] Bishop Gray found the search for men, and the various anxieties attending on these appointments, harassing and wearing, but these were by no means the chief or heaviest anxiety pressing upon him. He had now fairly plunged into what may be advisedly called alike the great trial of his whole career,

[1] The Metropolitan wrote to Dean Douglas, February 3rd: "The consecration of the two Bishops took place in Westminster Abbey yesterday, the Bishop of Oxford preaching. I have had immense difficulties and anxieties about this. On Saturday the Archbishop's secretary wrote to tell me that, in his judgment, the oath of canonical obedience could not by the Jerusalem Act be made to the Metropolitan of South Africa. I went down at once to Addington and told the Archbishop I could not join, but must formally protest against the consecration. Twiss and Bishop of London both working against me. Archbishop most anxious to do as I wished, but timid about law. I did not know till I came back from preaching for Zambesi in the city at ten o'clock at night that all would be right, and I went down in the morning still with my protest in my pocket. If I had not been very firm, we should have had two jurisdictions, and, as far as we could make it, two Churches, and the Jerusalem Act would have carried the day."

and the episode for which the whole Catholic Church of Christ will ever remember his name with gratitude and reverence. No need to say we mean the (so-called) Colenso Case.

A somewhat remarkable letter from Dr. Colenso to the Bishop of Oxford has been preserved, dated Lostwithiel, November 19th, 1853 (about ten days before his consecration), in which he complains of an attack made upon him by the *Record* newspaper, as supporting Mr. Maurice's views, which at that time were much canvassed and deprecated by Churchmen and the religious world. It is noticeable that, in this letter, Dr. Colenso distinctly repudiates doctrines which he not long afterwards as distinctly taught. After mentioning Village Sermons, which were dedicated to Mr. Maurice "as an opportunity of saying a few kind words to him at a time when others were dealing so harshly by him," Dr. Colenso goes on to say: "You will observe, however, that I have expressly limited my address to an acknowledgment of gratitude derived from his teaching, specifying *one* particular point, that of Universal Redemption as connected with the Incarnation of the Son of God, which for me and others he had brought into clearer light. . . . But as to the other points on which his book is objected to, I am quite silent. An honest man would have concluded that I did *not* mean to adopt his views on these points, more especially, as with regard to two of them—his view of the Atonement and of eternal punishment—I happen to have used in several places in my sermons the popular language,—to have spoken of the death of our Lord as *penal*, and of the woe of a lost soul as *endless*."

It will be remembered that, when in England in 1858, Bishop Gray had occasionally alluded to anxieties with respect to Natal,[1] which followed him in the shape of consultations from both Bishop and Clergy. Dr. Colenso's appointment had been suggested by Dr. Hills of Great Yarmouth, when himself declining to take the office as Bishop of Natal, and the recom-

[1] In his very detailed and confidential correspondence with the Bishop of Oxford these anxieties are constantly referred to in the kindliest, most considerate manner.

mendation being endorsed by the Bishop of Norwich (Dr. Hinds) and others, he had been consecrated at the same time as Bishop Armstrong; and while travelling and working together, a most kindly and affectionate intercourse had existed between the Metropolitan and Bishop Colenso. Bishop Gray was in very weak health from overwork and over-excitement, and, as he himself says, he was watched over and cared for very tenderly by his new fellow-labourer, and until the period of Dr. Colenso's return to England in 1862 to publish the first part of his work on the Pentateuch, they were "as brothers." Their correspondence was unceasing and most confidential. The Bishop of Natal had many troubles and trials from the time he first reached his Diocese, owing to the unsettled state of things in the Church itself, and the way in which Bishops were sent forth by the Mother Church to found and organise churches in all parts of the Colonial Empire, as best they might, without any code of instructions, without counsel or guide of any kind, without any Board of Missions, or recognised authority in any shape, to which they could refer under critical circumstances.

"In consequence of my being the founder of the work of the Church in Natal," Bishop Gray writes, "and my connection with all that had previously taken place there, and also because of the relation in which I stood as Metropolitan to the new Diocese, I was consulted by both Bishop and Clergy about everything that happened, and gave what help I could in the solution of difficulties."

One of these questions was how far polygamy was to be allowed among the converted heathen, a matter which roused much excitement and opposition in the Diocese. On this the Metropolitan abstained from expressing a decided opinion, believing that it required the deliberation and determination of a Synod of the Church. Another point was the formation of a Church Council, respecting which he differed from the Bishop of Natal, who proposed that it should consist of Clergy and Laity voting together as one body, but always with an excessive number of Laity. About half his Clergy refused to sit in such an assembly, and the Metropolitan thought them right.

The question was brought before the Archbishop of Canterbury, who at first took the Bishop of Natal's view, but, on learning facts, and perceiving that the position and powers of the Clergy as a distinct Order in the Church were damaged by such an arrangement, he changed his mind. Furthermore, both Bishop and Clergy referred the teaching of the former respecting the Holy Eucharist to the Metropolitan, who regretted greatly some of his language as unguarded and unsatisfactory; yet, believing that it might be construed consistently with the Church's formularies, and desiring earnestly to support Bishop Colenso in every way possible, to allay disturbance, and lead the Clergy to give him due obedience, he did his best to explain it favourably and to promote peace. "In my efforts to accomplish this, I know that I made the hearts of faithful men sad," he writes: "I know that they who thought they were contending for great principles which were endangered felt discouraged and aggrieved."

Some of Bishop Colenso's doubts had evidently reached the Metropolitan, for, in a letter dated November 20th, 1860, Bishop Gray, after alluding to the difficulties raised by his Suffragans concerning Bishop Mackenzie's consecration, and playfully observing—"The Bishops are clearly wrong, as you may suppose, if they differ from *me !!*" goes on to say; "But Natal is a very wilful, headstrong man, and loose, I fear, in his opinions upon vital points. We shall have to fight for Revelation, Inspiration, the Atonement, and every great truth of Christianity, ere long."

When Bishop Colenso came to Bishop's Court in December 1860, all his brother Bishops were painfully struck by his changed manner, by a gloomy reserve and half-restraint, while yet he at times broke forth with opinions which grieved them much. The Bishop of S. Helena (Dr. Claughton) had a great deal of conversation with Bishop Colenso on various subjects which troubled him, although (as stated in the Preface to Part I. of his book on the Pentateuch) the Bishop had not then begun to enter, while fully intending to do so on his return to Natal, upon the inquiries which led him, a little later, to write to a friend (we

are still quoting from his own Preface) that he "felt more hopelessly than ever how hollow is the ground upon which we have so long been standing, with reference to the Inspiration of Scripture;" and that, "for myself, if I cannot find the means of doing away with my present difficulties, I see not how I can retain my Episcopal office, in the discharge of which I must require from others a solemn declaration that they 'unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament,' which, with the evidence now before me, it is wholly impossible to believe in."

Speaking of this time, Bishop Gray says, in a letter dated January 9th, 1861: "I am very anxious about Natal. His views are dangerous. I fear that we may have taught in Africa 'another Gospel which is not another.' It is curious and painful to see how the reaction of his mind from the utter Calvinism in which he was brought up, is driving him to the contemplation of God solely as Love, the Loving Father of all creation,—into opinions which seem to me to undermine the whole Gospel scheme—no Atonement in the true sense of the word—no need of any—no eternity of punishment—ultimate universal salvation. I do not say that he has worked out all this into a scheme, but I think that he speculates most dangerously upon these points."

However, Bishop Colenso concurred in most of the proceedings at the Conference of Bishops, and took part in the consecration of his friend Bishop Mackenzie. In the month of June following, the Bishop published a new Translation and Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans, which he sent to the Metropolitan, who at once intreated him to withdraw it from publication, but in vain.

"You will be sorry to hear" (Bishop Gray wrote to Dr. Williamson, July 18th, 1861), "that the Bishop of Natal has printed a Commentary on the Romans, containing opinions similar in most respects to Maurice's on the Atonement, and to the Essays on other points. On the Inspiration of Holy Scripture, Justification (all heathen, etc., are righteous and accepted before God from their birth), Original Sin, the Sacra-

ments, the Judgment, Eternal Punishment, Universal salvation, he has propounded opinions at variance with those of the Church. I have not heard of any one having a copy of the book but myself, and I have written to pray him to keep it back for at least a year, and consult his friends, but I do not expect that he will do this. He is at times quite inconsistent in the language which he uses, often expressing himself on the Atonement and on other points in evangelical language. I expect that the Dean of Pieter Maritzburg will present him to me. I shall be cautious how I act, and feel the difficulty of my position."

To the BISHOP OF OXFORD.

"Bishop's Court, July 15th, 1861.

"My dear Bishop—What I have for some time apprehended with regard to the Bishop of Natal has come to pass. He has published a Commentary on the Romans, full, as I conceive, of the most objectionable views, and entirely substituting a new scheme for the received system of Christianity. This is strong language, but, I really think, not too strong. Upon the Inspiration of Holy Scripture, the Atonement, Justification, Original Sin, the Sacraments, the Judgment, Eternal Punishment, Universal Salvation, he has affirmed opinions at variance, as I conceive, with those taught by the Church of England, and ever held by the Catholic Church. The book has probably been sent to Mr. Maurice; if so, I hope you will get a sight of it. In case you should not, I forward to you certain extracts from this work, that you may have some idea of the views set forth. Of course they will not convey to you the freshness and eloquence of the book itself. I have only the copy which has been sent to me, and I do not hear that any one else has one. This has led me to hope that it is not published, and I have written to him praying him to keep it back, and reconsider it and consult his friends. Though the book is full of Maurice, I feel satisfied that there is much in it of which he would not approve. I have also written to the Bishops of Graham's Town and S. Helena, to ask them what they think I or we ought to do. I wish you also to counsel me, and if you

think that I ought to ask counsel in the matter of the Archbishop or the Bishops, then to do so formally for me, in my name. My own feeling is that such a book cannot be allowed to be put forth among us silently, and without notice. I feel satisfied that if it is published it will make a disturbance here, and that the Dean of Pieter Maritzburg, and probably others of his Clergy, will present him formally to me. I should add that his language is frequently inconsistent with himself—at times it is strictly evangelical. He has not worked out his theory with exact accuracy."

On September 18th, 1861, the Bishop writes again: "I am in great anxiety about the Bishop of Natal's book on the Romans, and do not yet see my way clearly as to what I should do. By next mail I *may* hear from S. Oxon, but hardly expect it. The Bishop of Graham's Town urges something being done. He really ought to be tried or suspended. But you may imagine at least some of the difficulties of my position with regard to such a step, though perhaps not all of them. It would open out questions far more perplexing than those raised in Long's case, and I unfeignedly shrink from having *two* on my hands, and the probabilities of mistakes on my part. I shall be cautious what I do, but I trust and pray that I may be guided to see my duty, and strengthened to perform it."

To the Bishop of Oxford.

"November 15th, 1861.

"I have by this mail written to the Archbishop of Canterbury about the Bishop of Natal's book, and asked him to bring the subject before the Bishops of his province, and counsel me how to act. I have forwarded the book to him, and also to you. I have also sent him a copy of the correspondence between the Bishop and myself, and of one between him and the Dean of Pieter Maritzburg, and Archdeacon Fearne, forwarded by them officially to me. The Bishop wished me to apply directly to the Archbishop, rather than through you. I have therefore done so. . . . The Clergy and Laity in Natal

are very uneasy . . . the book is doing mischief, and unhinging men's minds, not a few saying that it is a very liberal and comfortable Gospel, and all right!"

"November 18th, 1861.

"I am in great trouble about the Bishop of Natal's book. The Dean of Pieter Maritzburg and Archdeacon Fearne have forwarded to me their correspondence with the Bishop, and asked counsel. I have been in correspondence with him, and have formally laid the matter before the Archbishop, asking him to consult his Bishops, and tell me what my duty is with reference to that book. I am doomed never to be out of hot water! This touches, however, the very Faith in its most essential points. I am appealed to publicly and privately, and I have been long convinced that our brother was conscious of holding views subversive of the received interpretations and teaching of the Church. Nothing can well be more delicate or more difficult than my present position. I hope that I shall be guided aright."

The letter addressed by the Metropolitan to the Archbishop of Canterbury (Archbishop Sumner) was as follows:—

"Bishop's Court, November 12th, 1861.

"My Lord Archbishop—It is with very great pain that I forward for your Grace's consideration a copy of a Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, recently published by the Bishop of Natal, and ask you to counsel me as to my duties and responsibilities with reference to it. The volume appears to me, I confess, amidst much that is excellent, to contain unsound opinions upon many points of deep importance, more especially with reference to the Inspiration of Holy Scripture, the doctrine of the Atonement, and Eternal Punishment. The questions which I desire to propose to your Grace, and through your Grace to the Bishops of your province, are—*First,* Whether the Bishop's teaching is so erroneous as to make it a duty which the Church owes to her Lord and to her members to rid herself of the guilt of sharing it? *Secondly,* If so, in what way this

should be done? Whether by synodical condemnation, or trial, or in some other way?

"I think it right to forward to your Grace a copy of the correspondence which has already passed on the subject between the Bishop and myself; also a copy of the correspondence provided to me by the Dean of Pieter Maritzburg and Archdeacon Fearne. I have also been in correspondence on the same subject with the Bishops of Graham's Town and S. Helena. The Bishop of Graham's Town, who has himself been in correspondence with the Bishop of Natal about his book, takes precisely the same view of our brother's teaching as myself, and feels as strongly as I do that it cannot be left unnoticed; but, with me, he is in doubt as to the way we should proceed. The Bishop of S. Helena had not seen the book when I last heard from him. The book has excited great uneasiness and alarm amongst both Clergy and Laity in this province, and I am appealed to in various ways to take action upon the subject.

"Whatever is to be done, I presume that the responsibility of proceeding rests chiefly with myself. Much as I love, and in many respects admire my brother, from whom I feel that I may learn a great deal, I shall not, I trust, allow private feelings to interfere with the discharge of duty, when I can make up my mind as to what my duty is. Your Grace will, I am sure, feel that in a matter of so grave a character, and happily so novel in our Church, I may be permitted to seek for counsel from the fathers of the Church at home.

"Praying that God may guide us all into the truth, I am, your Grace's faithful and obedient servant, R. CAPETOWN."

To the BISHOP of OXFORD.

"Bishop's Court, December 17th, 1861.

. . . "The Bishop of Natal quite approves of my letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, of which I sent him a copy, and says that he knows that I shall always show the utmost kindness that my sense of duty will admit. Poor dear fellow! I feel deeply grieved about him. I really believe that a philosophical Catholic would set him straight. One or two wrong

principles are at the bottom of his errors. I think that I shall, without entering into a discussion with him on particular doctrines, try to get him to look at his opinions from a different point of view from what he has hitherto done."

"I have had a very touching letter, full of kindness and sympathy, from the dear old Archbishop" (the Metropolitan writes, March 18th, 1862), "about the Bishop of Natal's book, and the part I have taken. . . . It is a sad position for his Clergy, who feel that he is a heretic; it injures the faith of many. 300 copies of the book have been sold in Cape Town, where, chiefly among the Dutch, rationalistic views are spreading. Something must be done in this case. If the Bishops at home can do it, I should thankfully hand over my erring brother to the Patriarch, but the Church of England is awfully trammelled by State law."

To the BISHOP of OXFORD.

"Bishop's Court, March 20th, 1862.

"My dear Bishop—I had a most kind letter on the subject of Natal's book from the dear old Archbishop, which greatly relieved my mind. I believe that he is just leaving for England. Should Convocation think that the book is heretical, and that he or it should be proceeded against, it appears to me that the *book* would be condemned with more weight by you; and that possibly the Archbishop *qua* Patriarch might try him, but unfortunately the English Ecclesiastical Courts are a great bar to this. My own belief is, that if such a step were deemed necessary by the Bishops at home (and I would not act without this), the Bishops of this province might try, and the Metropolitan deprive a Suffragan—probably with a right of appeal to the Patriarch. If the judgment of the Supreme Court here is sustained by the Privy Council, this at least is clear, that Colonial Courts would be compelled to uphold Bishops, Metropolitans, Provinces, Patriarchs, in their respective rights; and the only difficulty will be to make out clear for Courts, should cases come before them, what these rights are. My appeal, therefore, is of the utmost importance to the whole

Church, whether at home or in the Colonies. It will settle for ever, not only what our status is in the Colonies, but what our relation is to you, and yours to us. I have upheld in my speech the Patriarchal rights. I am not sure, however, that I agree with you about them. The Patriarchate of Alexandria has peculiar privileges, and the Archbishop of Canterbury, though in earlier ages sometimes called a Patriarch (Twiss once gave me the authorities for this), has never been formally acknowledged as a Patriarch, and I do not know whether it could be done, for if I remember right the counsel of the other Patriarchs is necessary.

"Something, however, should be done, for questions like that of Welby's consecration are being settled in different ways, and there will be disputes. Adelaide, all the New Zealand Dioceses, Canada, claim to elect their own Bishops. *We* have declared that no appointment is to be made to Cape Town without the consent of the Church here. Meantime, not the consecration only, but the actual appointment of Welby, is assumed by the Secretary of State and Archbishop, without the canonical reference either to the Bishops of this province or his own.

"I do not think that the Archbishop could maintain his right to appoint all Bishops *qua* Patriarch. The Colonies would, I think, pretty generally resist."

In May 1862 the English Bishops had a meeting to consider the questions proposed by the Metropolitan of South Africa, and as we know, he was himself at that moment actually on his way to England. During the voyage Bishop Gray heard from a fellow-passenger (a member of the Zambesi Mission, who had recently touched at Natal) that Bishop Colenso had just printed privately and circulated among his friends another book attacking the inspiration of Holy Scripture, and had lent it to him (the Bishop's informant) to read. This was Part I. of the work called *The Pentateuch Critically Examined*, and Bishop Colenso was actually following in the next mail to England with the intention of publishing it there.

Naturally this did not tend to make Bishop Gray more

easy as to the state of things. On his arrival in London he was met by private letters from most of the Bishops who had assisted at the recent meeting to discuss the Commentary on Romans, expressing their decided opinion as to the unsoundness of that book; though, considering that the two Archbishops would very probably be called upon to give a judicial utterance on the subject, it was not thought right that they should commit themselves beforehand by expressing any public judgment. Archbishop Sumner's letter concluded with the words: "I am greatly struck by the mildness and conciliatory spirit which you have united with the firmness and decision exhibited in the whole of your distressing correspondence with the Bishop of Natal."

As soon as Bishop Colenso arrived in England, the Metropolitan wrote to him as follows:—

"London, August 8th, 1862.

"My dear Brother—You would be surprised to find me in England. I did not make up my mind till three or four days before sailing. The Clergy, however, urged me very strongly in the critical state of the Mission. I am glad that I came, though I did so very reluctantly, for I had arranged for a Visitation, upon which I should now have been. I found on arriving that the Bishops had discussed at a meeting our correspondence and your Commentary. All, I believe, felt the gravity of the subject, and some expressed themselves very strongly. Since my arrival in England I have conversed with several of them, and had communication with others. The desire on the part of some has been very strong that two or three of the Bishops should meet you, and discuss the subject with you lovingly as brethren, in the hope that they might be able to satisfy you that you were in error on certain points, and that nothing in the meantime should be done on your part to compromise yourself or the Church further. I need not say that at this late period of the season all have dispersed to their dioceses, and that it would require some little time to get two or three together at a time which would suit the convenience of all. If

you are willing to meet them, I will make the attempt. Since leaving the Cape I have heard that it was known both there and here that you have another work, it is said denying the authenticity and inspiration of the Pentateuch, already in print. I was asked repeatedly if I had seen it, on my arrival here. Among others the Bishop of Labuan seems to have spoken about it. If there be such a book, let me entreat you not to publish it, at least until after your interview with our brethren at home. I am sure that the true Christian course is that which I have suggested. I came up here to preach, and believe I must leave town on Monday. My wife joins in kind regards to Mrs. Colenso. The Archbishop is in a very precarious state; he feels this case very deeply, but is not well enough to act in it himself. He wrote to me about it, and I have conversed with him since I came home.—Ever affectionately yours,

"R. CAPETOWN."

Again, August 12th, 1862, the Metropolitan wrote to Bishop Colenso, pleading earnestly and, as he thought, tenderly with one who had been as a brother to him, urging him to take counsel with Bishops whom he considered more learned and more likely to have weight with Bishop Colenso than himself. The Archbishop of York (Longley) and the Bishops of Oxford and Lincoln promised to come to London on purpose to enter upon a friendly discussion with the Bishop of Natal, but he would not accept their offer. Meanwhile, as the Commentary on the Romans had been formally presented to the Metropolitan by the Dean of Maritzburg and Archdeacon Fearne, he felt that, whether supported or not, he would have to take action; and this conviction could only be increased by the publication in October of Bishop Colenso's first part on the Pentateuch, which was rapidly followed by the succeeding volumes;—Part II. appearing January 1863, and putting forth still more unqualified and unbelieving statements, practically accusing all the Bishops and Clergy of the English Church with hypocritical falsehood[1] in the exercise of their ministerial functions, especially in the Sacra-

[1] Colenso's *Pentateuch*, Part II. p. 21.

ment of Holy Baptism; and inviting them, as the only "remedy, to omit such words, to disobey the law of the Church, and take the consequences;" while bitterly inveighing against Ordination vows and the fetters of subscription, "owing to which" the Clergy either dare not think at all on such subjects, or, if they do, dare not express their thoughts freely from the pulpit or by means of the press, without incurring the danger of being dragged into the Ecclesiastical Court by some clerical brother who has himself no turn, perhaps no faculty, for thinking; or who else has abandoned his rights and duties as a reasoning man, to become the mere exponent of a church-system or a creed; but who will at least prevent others from exercising their powers of thought in the inquiry after truth, and so disturbing the quiet repose of the Church. How, in fact, can it be expected that a Clergyman should venture to "*think*" on these subjects, when by so doing he is almost certain to come to doubt, and disbelieve some portion at least, of the Church's doctrines?" The writer goes on to affirm that the Clergy are "required to hush up the *facts* which they know, and publish and maintain in place of them—by silence at least, if not by overt act—transparent *fictions*."

This is not the place wherein to enter upon an analysis or refutation of Bishop Colenso's writings, a task which has been clearly and ably done by those competent to the undertaking.[1] Suffice it to say, that even before the appearance of the Second Part of the Pentateuch, a general and increasing indignation at "the sight of a Bishop pulling the Bible to pieces," had arisen in the Church, and the Metropolitan began to be urged on all sides to take action, and was even reproached for what some mistook as unconcern and indifference. How far from deserved this reproach was, it is needless to say, or that he was really endeavouring to do whatever might be in his power in defence of the Faith. In a letter to Mr. Keble, who had written—"congratulating you (if that is the right word) on the great things

[1] The Metropolitan writes to Dean Douglas, February 3rd, 1863: "I am sending you some replies to the Bishop of Natal. Pritchard's, as far as it goes, is, I think, excellent. S. Oxon and the Archbishop think it one of the best."

which your Province is doing in Christendom. You do, indeed, set us an example of not slumbering or sleeping"—he says:

"Tarrant Gunville, November 4th, 1862.

"It is a great privilege to have your support and encouragement in my work. . . . It is, I trust, pleasing God to enable His Church to do some work for Him in Africa, but it is still in its infancy, and surrounded with many difficulties and discouragements. The Bishop of Natal is our greatest distress at this time. I have been in counsel with the Bishops respecting his first work, and shall be ere long respecting his second. I trust that I may be guided aright as to the course to be adopted with regard to him. But the case is a new one, and, happily, the precedents are not many. At this moment I am uneasy as to the claim which the Privy Council may set up as to the interference with cases of discipline in the Colonial Churches. I am sure that they will not submit to much interference, and that if it is attempted, it will lead to schisms. . . . I hope that I have a Bishop for the Free State. I am now attempting to found a Mission in Madagascar."

At last, November 25th, Bishop Gray wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury as follows:—

"My dear Lord—The communications which I receive respecting this last sad book of the Bishop of Natal make me feel how necessary it is that I, at least, should decide what my own course as Metropolitan should be. Men are getting impatient, even under the present short delay. I do not like to move without the counsel and advice of the Church at home, or, at least, without informing your Grace of the course which I may feel it my duty to adopt. Could I see your Grace on Saturday?"

In a letter to the Dean of Cape Town (Mr. Douglas) written from Lavington, January 2nd, 1863, the Bishop says:

"I have been thinking a great deal about this trial, and I have to-day had a talk with S. Oxon. He quite agrees with my view. I am satisfied on these points:—1. The Bishops, even though only Graham's Town and I should be present, meet as

the Synod of the Province, and also as a Court to try the Comprovincial. 2. As a Synod they may declare what the Faith of the Church is, and as a Court condemn. I will not be bound by the narrow limits, as to the Church's Faith, laid down by Dr. Lushington or Privy Council. I will not recognise them as an authority as to what are the doctrines which the Church of England allows to be taught. The Privy Council will make itself, if not checked, the *de facto* spiritual head of the Church of England, and of all religious bodies in the Colonies. I believe this to be the greatest of our many dangers."

Meanwhile addresses began to pour in from Clergy and Laity to the Bishops, and to Convocation; while the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel appealed formally to the Archbishop of Canterbury, as their president, for advice as to their proper course, the Bishop of Natal being one of their Vice-presidents, and receiving large contributions from the Society for his Missions. Before replying to this, and with a view to calming the general excitement in the Church, the Archbishop felt it only right to summon all the English Bishops, as also such Irish and Colonial Bishops as were available, to meet and consider how best to deal with the matter.

Accordingly, on February 4th, 1863, there was a large meeting at the Bounty Office (the meeting place of the Upper House of Convocation), of which the Metropolitan of South Africa took copious notes at the time, from which the following details are given. There were present the Archbishops of Canterbury (Longley)[1] and York and Armagh; the Bishops of London, Oxford, Winchester, Bangor, Lincoln, Worcester, Llandaff, Hereford, Carlisle, Rochester, Gloucester and Bristol, Manchester, Sodor and Man, Chichester, Exeter, S. Asaph, Durham, Chester, Salisbury, S. David's, Bath and Wells, Derry, Down, Montreal, and Tasmania. After prayer, the Archbishop having alluded to the death of Bishop Mackenzie, stated that the S. P. G. had asked advice as to their duty in regard to the Bishop of Natal—whether, under the grievous scandal caused by his writings, they ought to re-elect him as one of their vice-presidents, and whether, until the scandal were removed, he ought to be permitted

[1] Archbishop Sumner died September 6th, 1862.

YALE MISSIONARY LIBRARY, DIVINITY SCHOOL.

to administer the funds of the Society. Some discussion then took place, not as to any doubtfulness concerning the scandal given by the Bishop of Natal, as to which all agreed, but different opinions were expressed as to how far it behoved the Bishops to advise the Society. The Bishops of Oxford, Lincoln, and Exeter explained that it was the Archbishop who took counsel with his brethren as to the course he should take, not the Society consulting them; and then the Archbishop put the question, Shall any advice be given to the Society?

The Bishop of Exeter (Phillpotts) said, that looking at the custom of the Primitive Church, to place alms at the disposal of the Bishop, he thought that, before departing from so sound and ancient a provision, the Bishops should first come to a decision whether the Bishop of Natal had forfeited the confidence of the Church. So dignified a body as that then present should first settle this question. There were present nearly the whole of the English Episcopate, several Bishops of the Irish and Colonial Churches. It appeared to him that they should first resolve that the Bishop of Natal had forfeited the confidence of the Church. After some remarks from the Bishop of S. David's, the Bishop of Exeter went on to say that he himself felt the gravity of the question very deeply. The Bishop of Natal had put forth views affecting the faith of the Catholic Church: all must feel that a *prima facie* case had been made out against him. He should feel obliged to say that the Bishop had forfeited the confidence of the Church, and he was ready to say to the Society, "Suspend your confidence." This was his judgment on this unhappy case. We must protect the Church from seeming to regard with indifference so great an assault upon the faith. If ever there was a case in which the whole Church felt no confidence in a Bishop, it was this. The Bishops *could* not give an answer evading responsibility. (Hear, hear.) The case was one of singular notoriety, of vast scandal, of universal reprobation. The Bishops could not advise his Grace to shrink from responsibility, or urge him to decline replying fully and frankly to the Society.

The Archbishop said he gathered that there was a remark-

able concurrence of opinion as to the main fact, that the Bishop of Natal had lost the confidence of the Church, though some thought that they were not sufficiently informed on the subject to speak as decidedly as they could wish.

To this the Bishop of Exeter replied that it was a subject on which all ought to be thoroughly informed. After some further conversation, the Bishop of Oxford's resolution was carried, to the effect that the Bishops now present "respectfully advise his Grace, that the circumstances of the case of the Bishop of Natal are such as in our judgment to make it necessary for the Society to withhold its confidence from that Bishop until he has been cleared from the charges notoriously incurred by him."

The Bishops then proceeded to discuss the general question of the Bishop of Natal's publications. The Archbishop said, that, in his judgment, the question of such a book having been put forth by a Bishop of the Church was one which could not be passed over. He wished to know the opinion of his brethren as to the steps to be taken in this great emergency—a moment which, he believed, was a crisis in the history of the Church.

The Bishop of Winchester (Sumner) thought that the first question was, whether any legal proceedings were to be taken.

The Archbishop said it was clear that the Bishop of Cape Town alone, as Metropolitan, could take proceedings, and that he himself, as Primate, at least in the first instance, had no power to do so; and he called upon the Bishop of Cape Town to state his intentions.

To this the Bishop of Cape Town replied, that he had consulted most of the Bishops individually, and had also taken counsel with the Queen's Advocate and the Solicitor-General, Sir Roundell Palmer: both advised him that he could proceed against the Bishop of Natal, and suspend or deprive him; but that he could take no action in England, nor in Africa, until his office was promoted there, and until the sale of the Bishop's books had been proved there. The letters patent which constituted him Metropolitan were at this moment under discus-

sion before the Privy Council, and the judgment of the Judicial Committee might materially affect his legal powers. He was quite prepared to cite the Bishop to a trial so soon as he was in a position to do so; but the difficulties in this case were greatly increased by the fact that both the Bishop and himself were at this time in England. Several months must elapse before proceedings could be taken by him, and he trusted that the Bishops would not defer action because of the likelihood of a trial. He thought that the whole Church was looking to them to do something—that it was waiting with great anxiety for the result of this day's proceedings. His duties had of late taken him over every part of England, and he could truly say that everywhere the utmost anxiety prevailed as to what the Bishops of the Church might say and do at this crisis of our history. The weak and infant Church in South Africa was, he believed, quite prepared to do its duty in this matter; but he trusted that, as these publications were put forth here in England, in the face and in defiance of the whole Church, the Fathers of the Church at home would deal with them, and not throw the whole responsibility upon an unlearned and distant branch, whose hands would be greatly weakened if the Church at home were to remain silent and apparently indifferent.

The Bishop of S. David's (Thirlwall) made some obstructive remarks to the effect that, as he saw Convocation meant to deal with the book, it was useless to discuss it now. He should listen with great pleasure to the discussion, but he could himself give no opinion, nor did he even know what was the practical object in view in this discussion.

The Archbishop replied that the object he had in view was to ascertain if the Bishops were prepared to express an opinion, for which, he thought, the Church was waiting, on the subject of the Bishop of Natal's books.

The Bishop of Salisbury (Hamilton) said that he had prepared a Pastoral Letter to his Diocese on the subject, but on receiving the Archbishop's summons he withheld it. He considered that they were now meeting to take counsel as to their duty with regard to these books, which were shocking and

horrible. He should certainly feel it his duty to inhibit the Bishop of Natal from officiating in his Diocese.

The Bishop of Oxford said that he had looked through Part II. of the book, and could tell the Bishop of S. David's some of its contents. It affirmed boldly that the books of the Pentateuch were forgeries by Samuel or Jeremiah, and told the laity that "our (*i.e.* the Bishops) belief in these matters is the same as his own, but that we are too cowardly to say so."

The Bishop of Durham (Baring) thought the Bishops ought not to wait till legal proceedings were taken, and that the country expected them to do something. The Bishop of Winchester would be prepared to inhibit, even if legal proceedings were taken. Here the Bishop of S. David's remarked that the Bishop had said he did not mean to officiate. The Bishop of Oxford thought that such an assurance was not sufficient. In his judgment this was a case in which the Church should assert her authority and vindicate her discipline. He thought that the Bishops were bound to shelter the Church as far as it lay in their power to do, from the danger and poison of this Bishop's false teaching. We were not to depend upon his forbearance as to whether he would preach in our pulpits;—it clearly was their duty to direct their Clergy not to allow him to officiate until he had cleared himself of the existing scandal. This was absolutely necessary to quiet the mind of the Church.

The Bishop of London (Tait) said that there was not the slightest difference of opinion in that body as to the Bishop's teaching. They had no confidence in that teaching. But the Diocese of London was different from all other Dioceses; there must be a greater latitude and freedom given in it than in most others, from its peculiar circumstances as being the capital and centre of the land. He should be very sorry to cause needless disturbance to his great Diocese, which would be the result if he were to inhibit. He could not do so; and it was needless. The Bishop had distinctly said that he did not mean to officiate, and he thought it most undesirable to stir up people to make a martyr of the Bishop. He could not undertake the grave responsibility of stirring up strife in his Diocese by issuing a fulmination against the Bishop.

The Bishop of Chichester (Gilbert) said that he must certainly inhibit.

The Bishop of Winchester must do the same. If the Bishop of Natal had pledged himself not to officiate, he had violated his pledge, for he had quite recently done so in his Diocese.

The Bishop of Oxford here observed that, in justice to the Bishop of Natal, he must say that he had not given any such general pledge. What he had said was that he was "so busy with his present work in hand, that he could not accept offers to preach."

The Bishop of Exeter said that he would inhibit, and the Bishop of Chester (Graham) asked what was the course to be pursued in so doing—to which the Bishop of Oxford replied, that the Queen's Advocate said a general inhibition would not prohibit;—there must be a special and particular inhibition. But the mode of proceeding was not now the question. Clearly, if all agreed to inhibit, it would have a great moral effect, and that was what we had to look to. The Archbishop of York (Thomson) thought that it would be best for each Bishop who was inclined to inhibit, to do so by himself.

The Bishop of Oxford said there was all the difference in the world between the two modes of action;—the effect would be infinitely greater if all agreed as a body to inhibit, than if some, or even all, did so individually. What was needed was a Corporate Act.

Here the Archbishop asked for a definite Resolution, and the Bishop of Oxford read one, "That we agree, after common counsel, under a great scandal to inhibit. We would not assume the Bishop's guilt, as he has not yet been tried, nor make a charge against him, but assert that there was a great and notorious scandal."

The Bishop of London said it was not because he doubted whether or no the Bishop of Natal was fit to discharge duties in his Diocese that he objected to the course proposed, but because of the difficulties which would arise out of it. What he deprecated was, that anything should be done to raise Bishop

Colenso into a greater position than his present one, or to give him importance. It was their bounden duty to be very cautious not to add to this. If he heard that Bishop Colenso was going to officiate in his Diocese, he should stop him; but there was not one Clergyman out of the thousand in his Diocese that would think of asking the Bishop to officiate without first obtaining his leave. He thought it most important that this question should not be stirred up beyond what was absolutely necessary. We must not have a discussion raging if we could help it, nor put forward this man as one of the prominent men of the age. Nor must it appear or get abroad that the Bishops differ among themselves on these questions—this he wished to press upon his brethren. He thought there were only two courses open—I. To act judicially, which must depend upon either the Bishop of Cape Town or the Archbishop. II. For each Bishop to express, as occasion served, his own individual opinion, which might be done with vigour, and without using vague expressions. If this were done, it could not be said that the man had been made a martyr of. Any statement by the whole Episcopate must, to meet all views, be vague. The Bishop then made a suggestion that a Committee of Bishops should be appointed to put forth a Declaration on the whole subject of the Inspiration of Scripture.

The Bishop of S. David's again objected. He did not think the time for action had come. Inhibition would be premature, as prejudging a question which Convocation was about to discuss. Moreover, he thought the action of the Bishops now assembled not in Synod would be very unimportant. In short, he considered inhibition certainly superfluous, if not mischievous.

The Bishop of Lincoln (Jackson) thought that there was a confusion of ideas in the Bishop of London's mind about raising the Bishop ot Natal into importance. He had already assumed a position of very great importance by his bold and rash assumptions. That a Bishop of the Church should have published what he had, in itself lifted him into importance; we could not say that a man who had so rapidly sold 15,000 copies of a

book assailing the Bible, did not occupy a position of importance. The Church was watching to see what the Bishops would do under such circumstances—whether they would do their duty by this unfaithful teacher.

The Bishop of Llandaff (Ollivant) urged the adoption of the resolution, and the Archbishop of York (Thomson) opposed it, because it proposed a course which was highly penal. His opinion of the book was that it was thoroughly bad and mischievous, but he thought the Bishops must consider the effect such a course would have upon the laity; what, for instance, on lawyers (with whom, from circumstances, he had much intercourse). They would say, You prefer punishing to replying. It is easier to do so. He was for appointing a committee to examine the book.

The Bishop of Manchester (Prince Lee) was not prepared to concur in an inhibition, but wished for a declaration; the expectant country would be dissatisfied if nothing were done, and the mischief of the Bishops separating that day without some declaration would be immeasurable.

The Bishop of Rochester (Wigram), who had already put out a letter inhibiting the Bishop of Natal, in consequence of the strong representations made to him by leaders of both parties in the Church, thought that there would be general dissatisfaction if the Bishops took no action; and the Bishop of Winchester agreed in this opinion.

The Bishop of Cape Town then spoke. He said that we were fond of comparing ourselves with the primitive Church; how would it have acted if a Bishop had put forth views denying the Faith and destructive to the Bible as a revelation from God? It would undoubtedly have refused communion; and could the Church at home do less than forbid the proclamation of such views as far as lay in her power? Was it not the office of the Church and her Bishops to witness for Christ? and how could she witness for Him if she tolerated such teaching? Her own faithfulness to her Lord was in question. He believed that the mischief would be great if nothing were done—men would fall away. Moreover, how unfair it would be to the Church in Africa, to lend it no moral support in its difficulties,

to leave it to grapple, unaided, with this great evil. How would he himself be met when he brought the Bishop to trial? would he not be told that it had been published in the face of the Church at home, that it had challenged interference on the part of the Bishops; that wise and learned men had left it alone, and he should do the same? The silence of the Mother Church would incalculably weaken his hands. He thought that if the chief burden was to fall upon him, he was entitled to all the moral support that they could give him.

The Bishop of S. Asaph (Short) next spoke, saying that he thought the present assembly peculiarly qualified to deal with the question—almost every branch of our Church being represented. The Bishops did not often meet in such numbers, and in his opinion a very decided blow should be struck.

The Bishop of Oxford explained that by the terms of his resolution he wished to withhold anything like a legal opinion or judgment upon the books, and only desired to affirm that there was a scandal, and that the Bishops felt want of confidence in their brother's teaching.

After some more discussion, which was chiefly a repetition of what had been already said, the Archbishop of York proposed a declaration to the effect that the Archbishops and Bishops strongly disapproved of the book, were persuaded that it would not ultimately be permitted to injure the Church, but would be fully answered, saying that the Church of England could not deal judicially with the Bishop, which the Church in Africa alone could do.

The Bishop of S. David's still thought that any declaration must be regarded as a condemnation. He thought it undesirable for the Bishops to pledge themselves.

At last the Archbishop (having said that he felt his own proper course was to save his Diocese from the danger of such false teaching by inhibition, and that he thought it was equally the duty as regarded the whole Church; that, having listened attentively to all that his brethren had said, he remained of the same opinion as at the beginning, and it was his conviction that it was their duty, *pendente lite,* to inhibit,) put the Bishop of

Oxford's resolution, which was carried by twenty-one to six. He then put the Archbishop of York's declaration, with the result of thirteen for and thirteen against it. Nearly all were prepared to tolerate, very few heartily to accept of it. Accordingly the Bishop of Oxford moved that his resolution be adopted as that of the meeting; the Archbishop put it formally, and it was carried by twenty-five to four—the dissidents being the Archbishop of York, and the Bishops of London, S. David's, and Manchester.[1]

The Bishops met again on February 7th, one more being present, *i.e.* the Bishop of Ripon (Bickersteth).

The Archbishop of York then objected to a joint Pastoral such as had been suggested, which, he thought, would have no weight, but urged some joint resolution or declaration. At all events the Bench must not be silent, he said emphatically, for the book was a bad one, and they were bound to say so, yet without putting themselves into a false position as probable judges upon it hereafter. He and the Bishop of London had prepared a resolution which was read, but as it only alluded to Part I. of the *Critical Examination of the Pentateuch*, the Bishop of Cape Town observed that he hoped any resolution adopted would refer to all the three volumes published by the Bishop of Natal, especially the *Commentary on the Romans*, to which the Bishop himself referred as containing a full statement of his

[1] The Metropolitan wrote to Dean Douglas, February 4th, 1863: "I have just come home from our great meeting about Natal. The English, Irish, and Colonial Bishops were summoned. We discussed from 11 till 3.30, and meet again on Friday. Ultimately the Bishop of Oxford's resolution, the first moved, was carried, to the effect that under the scandal caused by the publication of his books, he should be inhibited from officiating by the whole Episcopate, *pendente lite*, till he was acquitted or condemned. The opponents were, as you might suppose. . . . All wished something done, and we had four propositions before us; the points to be guarded against were the Bishops condemning before trial. It was generally understood that he could only be tried by me, but it was assumed (we did not discuss the point—Manchester raising it, however, ably) that there would be an appeal to the Archbishop of Canterbury, with such Comprovincials as he chose to call in. Exeter shone, perhaps, the most of all. I never saw the good old man to such advantage, and the deference shown to him by all was great. Oxford, of course, more powerful than any. Winchester, Lincoln, Llandaff, Salisbury, very good. Manchester not bad."

views, and which had been presented to the Metropolitan by Bishop Colenso's own Dean and Archdeacon. He had thought it his duty to refer it to the late Archbishop, who had, he believed, submitted it to the Bishops, and they had met to discuss it under the presidency of the present Archbishop. If now they were to pass a solemn formal resolution, omitting any allusion to that work, it would seem very like endorsing the views it contained.

Several Bishops, among them Salisbury and Hereford, agreed to this, and the Archbishop confirmed their opinion. The Archbishop of York then asked why the Bishops who met to discuss the book at the time referred to had come to no conclusion; to which the Bishop of London replied that he believed he was the reason. Many of the Bishops wanted them to inhibit. "I would not inhibit," he said; "I have never read the book, and I hope never to do so."

"Can we tell our people," the Bishop of Salisbury asked, "that we know a book of dangerous character has been published by one of our brethren, but that we do not mean to notice it? That book is a horrible book. Surely we ought not merely to say that we have not read it, and hope never to read it, and therefore cannot condemn it?"

"It is not my business to do so," the Bishop of London replied with much warmth,[1] "I have little time for reading, and when I do read, I wish to read good books. The Bishop of Natal is within the Bishop of Cape Town's jurisdiction. What business had he to refer such a book as that to the Bishops of the Church here? It was most unfair in him to have brought such a book before us." He ought to have dealt with it himself, and not have brought unfair extracts from it, which did not represent its teaching, before them. He went on to accuse the Bishop of Oxford of having also dealt unfairly about the book, and said for his own part he would deal with no book unless it obtained notoriety; the Bishops had no business to be censors of all books that were published; they had other things to do, and this book on the Romans had had no sale.

[1] In his notes, Bishop Gray says, "great vehemence of manner and voice."

Some Bishop here remarked that it had gone through four or five editions.

The Bishop of Oxford said that he must reply to the Bishop of London's assertion that nothing could be more unfair than the way in which he had brought this book before the Bishops last year, by stating that he had not brought it before them at all! It was the Bishop of Winchester who had done so, at the request of the late Archbishop; and he trusted to the Bishop of London's fairness to withdraw such a charge, seeing it had no foundation. Bishop Wilberforce went on to say that the Bishop of Cape Town needed no defence at his hands;—he had simply done his duty, and he (the Bishop of Oxford) believed that thereby he had rendered great service to the Church. It was not fair to say that there had been any desire to condemn the book hastily. At their first meeting some had not read it, and they adjourned for a fortnight that they might read it. (The Bishop here read an extract from his diary to this effect.)

The Bishop of London said they did not adjourn.

Several Bishops successively stated that they had adjourned, the Bishop of Winchester produced documents which proved it, and the Bishop of Llandaff held up the copy of the book in question which he had bought in consequence of the adjournment.

The Bishop of London, defeated on this point, returned to the accusation that the Metropolitan had dealt most unfairly by Bishop Colenso, that he had imputed to him opinions which he denied, that he was actuated by personal motives, and that it was very unfair to bring the *Commentary on the Romans* before the English Bishops.

Thereupon the Bishop of Oxford read the records of last year's meeting, which proved the Bishop of London equally wrong in these statements as in the last. The Bishop of Winchester next went on to express his deep regret for the utterly uncalled-for and unjust attack made upon a prelate whom they all so deeply respected. He felt that the Bishop of Cape Town had fulfilled a very painful duty in as kind and courteous a way

as possible, and that had he acted in the way pointed out by the Bishop of London, he would not have done his duty.

The Bishop of London, on pressure, said he withdrew all expressions painful to the Bishop of Cape Town, but he still begged to ask the Bishop why he had not before this proceeded against the Bishop of Natal? and why he was not doing so now? It was his duty to have taken proceedings in Cape Town. The public will ask, and the Bishops ought to do so too, why he does not proceed? The public will not be satisfied unless the Bishop of Cape Town does take legal proceedings; and the Bishop of London begged again to ask him whether it was his intention to do so?

After a few kindly words from Archbishop Longley, the Bishop of Cape Town said he felt that there was little need for him to vindicate himself after the hearty defence made on his behalf by the Bishop of Winchester, and the withdrawal of offensive expressions on the part of the Bishop of London.

Here that prelate interrupted to say that he did not withdraw them as regarded the fairness of the charges against the Bishop of Natal.

In that case, the Bishop of Cape Town said, he must enter into a vindication of himself, and state the facts, which were these:—A book was published by a Bishop of his Province, which had had a considerable sale, and which, in his judgment, contained teaching contrary to the Faith, and at variance with the acknowledged formularies of the Church of England. He had to consider how he was to deal with it, and the conclusion to which he came was, that, considering the novelty and gravity of the occasion—a Bishop committing himself to false teaching in some of the most fundamental points of the Faith;—considering also the fact that the Church in Africa was an infant Church, and not possessed of the learning, experience, and wisdom which the Church at home enjoyed; and considering the relation in which he himself stood to the Archbishop of Canterbury, both by the terms of his letters patent, and through the patriarchal character of that See;—it was his duty, especially amid the uncertainties which beset the whole question of jurisdiction (which at that very hour was under discussion

before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council), to lay the whole matter before the Fathers of the Church of England through the Archbishop of Canterbury.

He therefore did this, and received the late Archbishop's thanks for so doing. While so doing he had not done what the Bishop of London still charged him with doing—he had not attacked the Bishop of Natal, still less had he acted towards him in any unkind spirit, or on personal grounds; and he was quite sure that the Bishop of Natal himself was no party to such a charge. They had lived together for nearly nine years as brethren in most affectionate intercourse. What he had done was to submit to his Grace the book that had been published, and with it a correspondence which he had had with the Bishop on the subject. That correspondence was in their Lordships' possession, and would speak for itself. If in writing to the Bishop he had in any way misapprehended his views, there were the Bishop's explanations at hand. Nothing, he believed, could be fairer than to submit the whole, keeping back nothing, to the Church at home; he might add that the Bishop of Natal was himself a party to this course, and wished the correspondence to go home. He would only add, that if he had dealt with this case without seeking that counsel which apparently most of the Bishops thought him entitled to ask, and had given freely and kindly, he should justly have been exposed to those animadversions which had been bestowed upon him. As to the Bishop of London's question, What he meant to do? he would do his best to reply, although that was no secret, and had already been a subject of conversation between them. At present he could do nothing, and months might pass before he could do anything. The book was published here in the Bishop of London's jurisdiction, not in the Bishop of Cape Town's, and he was advised by eminent lawyers that until its sale in Cape Town could be proved, he could not act. Even then, some one must promote his office in Africa; he could not be both judge and accuser. As soon as this was done, he hoped that he would not be found wanting in his duty. He should then cite the Bishop to appear before him, to answer to the charges brought against him. Probably he would not appear; but

would deny the Metropolitan's jurisdiction. But that would not deter him; the trial would still proceed. Further he could not go. He had a very difficult and delicate duty to perform, and it was a great comfort to know that in discharging it he had the sympathy of so many of the Bishops and of the Church at large.

The Archbishop of York went back to the Inhibition, which he said he was quite willing to accept, but he wanted the Bishops also to sign his Declaration. The Bishop of Lincoln said that he must be included in the Bishop of London's charge of injustice to the Bishop of Natal, for he had taken an oath to banish and drive away all false doctrine, and thought what had been done was in accordance with his vows. His objection to the Archbishop of York's declaration was, that it was a very feeble one. He did not think it could have any effect either on Bishop Colenso himself, or on those who were looking to the English Bishops to speak their mind. But if his brethren wished, he would sign it. The Bishop of S. David's declined with much disapproval to sign it, and entered at length into the question of refutation. (The Declaration contained a hope that the book would be satisfactorily refuted.) He did not think it would be ably refuted; and referring to some of the recent refutations of *Essays and Reviews,* implied that there were very few people capable of writing such refutations. After some good-humoured sparring between himself and the Bishop of Oxford, Bishop Thirlwall proceeded to say that no one could entertain a stronger opinion than himself that the position of the Bishop of Natal was utterly untenable; it was absolutely impossible that he could remain in the Church of England. Perhaps that was why he felt so little anxiety on the subject. He would let the Church and people generally know what the Bishop of Natal's real opinions are, and what his principles, when developed, would lead to. His book had revived old difficulties—perhaps in some degree strengthened them; but the amount of mischief which it did would depend upon the state of mind in which it was read. It was impossible that there ever could be a perfectly satisfactory reply to such a book. It was full of dogmatising on points upon which

it was impossible to have clear views. One of its great weaknesses consisted in the author's not reading between the lines of Scripture. There was much in so concise a document which needed to be filled up, and he resolutely refused to do this. There was not, the Bishop of S. David's affirmed, the slightest divergency of opinion between himself and his brethren as to the character of the book. This he repeated several times.

The Bishop of London having spoken again, the Bishop of S. Asaph remarked that he was sorry for this recurrence to the Bishop of Cape Town's intentions. He was surrounded with difficulties, and had a right to ask for his brethren's counsel, and they were bound to do what they could to help him.

The Bishop of Oxford now rose, and, after saying that it was impossible for him to sign the Archhishop of York's Declaration, and that he was constrained to urge all his brethren to weigh the matter well before they signed, he "burst forth," says the Bishop of Cape Town, "into one of the most eloquent speeches I have ever heard from him, which was all the more remarkable from its being addressed, not to a popular assembly, but to thirty grave Bishops met together to consider a matter of the deepest moment to the Church. It made a great impression."[1]

In this speech the Bishop of Oxford pronounced the Declaration as either too weak or too strong. If it meant to condemn the book, it was, he said, infinitely weak. Here was a book published in the face of the whole Church by one of our own order, which declared the Bible to be false and fictitious, which left us without anything to rest our faith upon, which proclaimed God's Inspired Word to be a book stamped with conscious falsehood: and we, the Bishops of the Church, met together to consider that book, to warn the Church against it, and protect weak brethren from its assertions, told them that we viewed the book with "strong disapprobation." Was that the language which the Bishops of the Church, the witnesses for Christ, the keepers of the oracles of God, the guardians of

[1] "Wilberforce made a wonderful speech in defence of the Bible, and in assertion of the duty of the Bishops of the Church in opposition to ——'s indifference," Bishop Gray wrote to his friend, Mr. Boyd of Arncliffe.

the faith, were to use under such circumstances? "*Strong disapprobation!*" We strongly disapproved of many things far less heinous than this! The language was all too feeble for the occasion. Would the Church of Rome, would conscientious dissenters, use such? If the Church had no stronger measure of condemnation, that would happen of which there was already danger, and men would seek for the defence and maintenance of the faith in other folds. He entreated his brethren, if they were to use the language of condemnation, not to be led into the adoption of words so utterly below the gravity of the occasion.

On the other hand, the Bishop went on to say, if there was to be no condemnation until Natal had been tried, the Declaration was too strong, for it condemned him, though feebly. He alluded to the Bishop of S. Davids' able remarks as to the difficulty of replying to this sort of attack, the impossibility of explaining every difficulty that might be started, and refuting every objection, however weak, owing to the fact that Holy Scripture contained but a short abstract of history, and did not enter into details or give explanations. And then, referring to what Bishop Thirlwall had said with reference to the Bishop of Natal's position, Bishop Wilberforce observed, that if, as it appeared, they all felt that it was his duty to resign—(hear, hear)—then, clearly, if he would not do so, it was their plain duty, as far as lay in their power, to prevent his officiating; and he thought the Archbishop's Declaration would weaken rather than strengthen the position the Bishops had taken up in the assertion of discipline. It was unmeaning. He then dwelt most earnestly and powerfully on their duty to banish and drive away all false doctrine.

The Archbishop of York defended his Declaration hesitatingly, after the power, so peculiarly his own, with which the Bishop of Oxford had set forth its weakness. Some discussion, joined in by several Bishops, took place; and at last the Bishop of Salisbury asked if they could not all join in a stronger Declaration? To this the Archbishop emphatically said No! He liked his own, and in the same way the Bishop of Oxford naturally liked best the address *he* had prepared;

whereupon the latter exclaimed: "Can any one for a moment suppose that, in a matter of such deep importance, one could care whose the production was?"

The Bishops of Down and Montreal spoke, the latter affirming that to his mind the greatest scandal of all was that such books should be published and no judicial proceedings against the author as yet instituted. To this the Bishop of Oxford replied that he believed the Bishop of London might proceed to-morrow. He might bring the Bishop of Natal into the Archbishop's Court as a Priest of the Church of England. If he saw fit he might bring all his teaching to a legal issue at once. He did not say that it *ought* to be done, but merely that it *could*.

The Archbishop of York laid his Declaration upon the table, and the Archbishop of Canterbury expressed his opinion that they were now in a position to consider the subject of a pastoral letter; but the Bishop of London maintained he could sign no Pastoral which was not written by himself, and, on further urging from some of his brethren, he repeated this as his fixed determination, and prepared to withdraw. Some altercation respecting his own individual line took place, in which the Bishops of Oxford, Winchester, Salisbury, and Norwich, etc., took part; and at length the Bishop of S. Asaph (Short) rose, and, with great emotion, reminded his brethren that they had begun their sitting with prayer for the guidance of God's Holy Spirit, which he believed to be with them; but that if they suffered themselves to wax warm, that Blessed Spirit would depart from them. All present really believed the Bishop of London was as opposed as they were to the Bishop of Natal's views, and he was quite mistaken in supposing that any one meant to impute to him any sympathy with them. He (the Bishop of S. Asaph) believed that, with the exception of the Bishop of Chichester, he was the oldest Bishop present, and he invited Bishop Gilbert to join with him in asking the President to offer up prayers before any more was said. He begged to propose "that they should fall to prayer."[1]

[1] "* . . . grew so violent that S. Asaph rose up with great emotion, told us we were in danger of losing the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and called us to prayer. It was a very remarkable scene." (Letter to the Rev. W. Boyd, February 23rd, 1863.)

After this a few friendly explanations were given, and the Bishop of Derry proposed that, as all sought the same end, though they differed as to the best means, they should appoint a Committee to prepare a document which all might sign. The Archbishop pressed this, feeling the importance of unanimity, and after some further discussion that course was agreed upon, the Archbishop remarking that this was the last attempt to secure united action, and he earnestly asked God to prosper it.

A few days later the Bishops met again, and the Archbishop read the letter which had been prepared by the Committee, calling upon the Bishop of Natal to resign his office. There was a good deal of discussion as to the precise wording of this letter, and its phraseology was here and there altered; but finally it was adopted and signed by forty-one of the Bishops present,[1] the only dissident being the Bishop of

[1] The Prelates who signed were —

C. T. Cantuar. (Longley).
W. Ebor. (Thomson).
Marcus G. Armagh (Beresford).
Whately Rd. Dublin (Trench).
A. C. London (Tait).
C. Dunelm. (Baring).
C. R. Winton (Sumner).
H. Exeter (Phillpotts).
A. T. Cicestn. (Gilbert).
J. Lichfield (Lonsdale).
T. Ely (Turton).
S. Oxon (Wilberforce).
Thos. Vowler S. Asaph (Short).
J. P. Manchester (Prince Lee).
J. Chester (Graham).
A. Llandaff (Ollivant).
John Lincoln (Jackson).
W. K. Sarum (Hamilton).
Auckland, Bath, and Wells (Lord Auckland).
R. Ripon (Bickersteth).
John T. Norwich (Pelham).
J. C. Bangor (Campbell).
J. C. Rochester (Wigram).
Samuel Carlisle (Waldegrave).
H. Worcester (Philpott).
Horace Sodor and Man (Powys).
Joseph H. Meath (Singer).
Plunket Tuam.
J. T. Ossory and Ferns (O'Brien).
Robert Cashel (Daly).
Robert Down and Connor and Dromore (Knox).
William Derry and Raphoe (Higgin).
John Cork, Cloyne, and Ross (Gregg).
H. Kilmore (Verschoyle.)
F. Montreal (Fulford).
F. Sydney (Barker).
F. R. Tasmania (Nixon).
Anthony G. Jamaica (Skinner).
G. T. Spencer, late Madras.
J. Chapman, Bishop.

The *Guardian* of March 4th, 1863, had authority to state that the Bishop of Hereford (Hampden) wished his name to be added to the list. Bishop Davys, of Peterborough, was absent, and Dr. Ellicott had not yet been consecrated to Gloucester and Bristol.

S. David's. Neither did the Bishop of Cape Town sign it—not of course, from dissenting in any way to it, but as a matter of delicacy considering his relation to the Bishop of Natal.

The letter was as follows:—

"To the Right Rev. T. W. COLENSO, D.D., Lord Bishop of Natal.

"We, the undersigned Archbishops and Bishops of the United Church of England and Ireland, address you with deep brotherly anxiety, as one who shares with us the grave responsibilities of the Episcopal office.

"It is impossible for us to enter here into argument with you as to your method of handling that Bible which we believe to be the Word of God, and on the truth of which rest all our hopes for eternity. Nor do we here raise the question whether you are legally entitled to retain your present office and position in the Church, complicated, moreover, as that question is by the fact of your being a Bishop of the Church in South Africa, now at a distance from your Diocese and province.

"But we feel bound to put before you another view of the case. We understand you to say (Part II. p. xxiii. of your *Pentateuch and Book of Joshua Critically Examined*) that you do not now believe that which you voluntarily professed to believe as the indispensable condition of your being intrusted with your present office. We understand you also to say that you have entertained and have not abandoned the conviction that you could not use the Ordination Service, inasmuch as in it you 'must require from others a solemn declaration that they unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament,' which, with the evidence now before you, 'it is impossible wholly to believe in' (Part I. p. xii.) And we understand you further to intimate that those who think with you are precluded from using the Baptismal Service, and consequently (as we must infer) other offices of the Prayer-book, unless they omit all such passages as assume the truth of the Mosaic history (Part II. p. xxii.) Now it cannot have escaped you that the inconsistency between the office you hold and the opinions you avow is causing great pain and grievous scandal

to the Church. And we solemnly ask you to consider once more with the most serious attention, whether you can, without harm to your own conscience, retain your position when you can no longer discharge its duties, or use the formularies to which you have subscribed. We will not abandon the hope that, through earnest prayer and deeper study of God's Word, you may, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, be restored to a state of belief in which you may be able with a clear conscience again to discharge the duties of your sacred office;—a result which, from regard to your highest interests, we should welcome with unfeigned satisfaction.—We are your faithful brethren in Christ," etc. etc.

The circumstances of these meetings, and the signatures affixed to this letter, are all-important facts with respect to later events, and to the difficulties and opposition which were to be the almost ceaseless trial of the remainder of the Bishop of Cape Town's life.

It is needless to say here that the Bishop of Natal did not comply with the advice given by his Episcopal brethren;[1] and on February 11th, 1863, the subject of his writings was brought before the Lower House of Convocation, when a motion was moved by Archdeacon Denison, seconded by Dr. M'Caul,

[1] In a letter from Archbishop Longley to the Bishop of Oxford, dated Lambeth Palace, March 6th, 1863, His Grace says: "You will see that Bishop Colenso's reply has soon appeared. He blinks the real question, and chooses to presume that we hinted at his giving up, not his Diocese, but his Episcopal Commission.

"In a letter to me he complains bitterly of the want of sympathy on the part of the Bishops when he came to England. But we offered, as you know, to confer with him, and, as you know, he declined the interview; and surely the tone and spirit of his books are such as to repel rather than invite sympathy."

On March 23rd, 1863, the Archbishop sent a Circular to all the Bishops, to this effect:—

"Lambeth Palace, March 23rd, 1863.

"My dear Lord—I herewith forward to you a copy of the Resolution to which you gave your assent at the meeting in the beginning of February. I wish to inform you that I am myself about to act in it.—I am, my dear Lord, yours very faithfully, C. T. CANTUAR."

"RESOLUTION.—That, having regard to the grievous scandal to the Church occasioned by certain books published under the name of the Bishop of Natal, and not disavowed by him, we, the undersigned, express our own resolution not to allow the said Bishop to minister in the Word or Sacraments within our several Dioceses until the said Bishop shall have cleared himself from such scandal."

and carried, that the standing orders be postponed in order to the moving of an address, praying the Upper House to direct the appointment of a Committee to examine Bishop Colenso's book on the Pentateuch, and to report whether any, and if so, what opinions, heretical or erroneous in doctrine, it contained.

A discussion of some length ensued, begun by the Archdeacon, who set before the House the two grounds on which his resolution was founded—*i.e.* that the book in question denied the truth of Holy Scripture, and impugned the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ. The Archdeacon observed that he did not anticipate any great amount of serious objection, for it seemed to him that they could not come there to do the business of the Church of England, and pass by such a book as this written in the Church of England, which denied such vital truths, and which was published in London, the centre of the civilised world and of the Province of Canterbury, which those present claimed to represent on the part of the Clergy. Dr. M'Caul said that the book had, to his knowledge, done great injury already among candidates for Holy Orders. He quoted Bishop Colenso's own assertion that, if his principles prevailed, in five years there would not be an intelligent young man from any of the Universities offering himself to be ordained, unless a change was made in the doctrines of the Church of England. "If we love the souls of the people and the Church which we have inherited, I hope we shall elevate our voice in the condemnation of this book."

Some feeble opposition was raised by one or two speakers of no great weight, after which Professor Harold Browne proposed an amendment, which was seconded by the Dean of Canterbury, affecting not the principle of opposition, but the manner of carrying it out. The Rev. J. Fendall, Rev. J. Bramston, Canon Woodgate, Dr. Jebb, the Rev. H. Mackenzie, Chancellor Massingberd, Canon Selwyn, and the Rev. C. E. Kennaway, the Rev. Mr. Mayow and Professor Jeremie, spoke, all at one as to the noxious character of the book, after which Archdeacon Denison's original motion was carried.

The resolution was sent to the Upper House on February

13th, and a debate of some duration also took place there, begun by the Bishop of London, who, after speaking at very great length, and with various references to the course adopted with respect to *Essays and Reviews*, ended by objecting to accept the proposal of the Lower House. The Bishop of St. David's spoke next, also alluding to that recently censured book, and pointing out the difference between Bishop Colenso and the authors thereof. "He is not, like these authors, a Bishop or a Clergyman who sincerely, however mistakenly, believes that his views are consistent with the doctrines of the Church of England, but he has expressly declared that the difference between his views and those doctrines is so great that, unless they should be brought to coincide by a movement which he expects, but which is still, to say the least of it, in the uncertainty of the future, it will be impossible for him to retain his office and position in the Church;" and on the ground (as expressed in a resolution which he brought forward) that Bishop Colenso's "ecclesiastical position will soon become untenable," he likewise opposed the course proposed by the Lower House.

The Bishop of Llandaff proposed a resolution to accede to that course in these words:—

"That the Upper House, having received a request from the Lower House of Convocation as to a book, etc. . . . and thinking fit to comply with the same, request that his Grace the President be requested to direct the Lower House to appoint a committee to examine the said book:" This was seconded by the Bishop of Lincoln, and carried by three to two—these two Bishops and S. Asaph voting for it, the Bishops of London and S. David's against it. The President remarked, when this was done, that to have refused would have seemed to him something like stifling inquiry.

The Committee delivered their report in the May following. It contained a brief analysis of the book, condemning its teaching and declaring that it contained "errors of the gravest and most dangerous character, subversive of faith in the Bible as the Word of God;" and that "the spirit of the book is not

that of sympathy with the faith and the hopes of the Church of Christ, but of antagonism to the general belief of Christian people."

The Lower House having forwarded this report to the Upper House, it was there taken into consideration, and the following resolutions were adopted:—

"I. That the said book does, in our judgment, involve errors of the most dangerous character, subversive of faith in the Bible as the Word of God.

"II. That this House, having reason to believe that the book in question will shortly be submitted to the judgment of an Ecclesiastical Court, declines to take further action in this matter at this time; but that we affectionately warn those who may not be able to read the published and convincing answers to the work which have already appeared, of its dangerous character."

Meanwhile Bishop Gray had returned to Africa. Before leaving England he left directions as to the presentment of the Bishop of Natal which was to be expected, desiring that the advice of the Queen's Advocate, R. Phillimore, might be closely followed, and directing that, as he was altogether unable to pay the legal expenses of these matters out of his income, stock should be sold for that purpose. The Metropolitan, accompanied by Bishop Tozer and others, reached the Cape April 11th. The following letter alludes to the voyage:—

To Charles Norris Gray, Esq.

"Bishop's Court, April 18th, 1863.

"My dearest Charlie—Your mother will have given you a better account of our proceedings hitherto than I can do; we were very weary of the voyage. I was not at all idle, and worked up a good deal of reading. The Bishop and Archdeacon (Thomas) made miserable sailors, and most of the officiating fell to me. We like them both very much. The Bishop bids fair to be driven into *puris naturalibus* in Central Africa. He has hardly any clothes, and only had two flannel shirts. . . He sails on Monday with all his party[1] in the 'Orestes.' I

[1] Among these was Dr. Steere, recently (1874) consecrated Bishop of Central Africa.

have had my hands full with his affairs since my arrival. Reaching home on Saturday evening, on Sunday I preached with reference to Colenso in the Cathedral; on Monday went down to the Admiral at Simon's Town to arrange about a ship. Last night we had a public meeting to welcome the Central African party, and bid them farewell, and all the week a house full. We found all our dear ones well, thank God, though Louisa looks and seems feeble. The Government has recalled Livingstone's expedition, but I hope that he will have got half his ship up the falls and be unable to leave. . . . The Clergy have prepared articles against Colenso. I shall probably cite him to a trial in November, making a Visitation of the Diocese in the interim."

Addresses were presented to the Metropolitan both by his own immediate Clergy and those of Natal respecting the painful matter of Bishop Colenso. "The case has been attentively considered by us," they said; "and while we are anxious that the proper steps should be taken to test the soundness of the opinions which the Bishop of Natal has published, and their compatibility with the retention of his high office, we are also prepared to take the share which belongs to us in giving efficacy to the Church's power of discipline, and putting her laws in force." In the Bishop's reply, after speaking of the new Bishops sent to the African field, and other local matters, he said concerning Bishop Colenso: "The affliction is a very heavy one, the reproach great. You are aware that the subject has engaged the earnest attention of the Church at home; that the Lower House of Convocation has taken the matter up; and that the Bishops, though unable to bring to a formal trial a Bishop belonging to a distant jurisdiction, have nevertheless called upon him, as brethren, to resign an office which in their judgment he ought no longer to retain. From a Cape paper I learn that he declines to do so. The Bishops will therefore very generally issue the inhibition upon which they had previously agreed. . . . You intimate your intention of bringing the teaching which he has put forth to the test of

a formal trial. I need scarce say that if, after full consideration of the subject, you still feel that you ought to frame articles against the Bishop, and present him for his writings, I shall feel it my painful duty to cite him to appear before myself and such other Bishops of this wide-spread province as can be gathered together, to answer the charges brought against him."

The Clergy of Natal "most humbly besought their Metropolitan's attention to the afflicted state of the Church among them," representing how much hurt had been done among souls by their Bishop's teaching. "Some had been shaken in the faith; others, wearied or perplexed, had grown cold, and turned aside to serve this present world." Bishop Gray alludes to this and his other pressing anxieties in the following letters:—

To CHARLES NORRIS GRAY, Esq.

"Bishop's Court, May 13th, 1863.

"My dearest boy—I seize a few quiet moments in the vestry[1] to write to you, as I have no time at home from press of work. To-morrow is Ascension Day; on Friday we go to D'Urban, Malmesbury, Paarl, etc., and do not return till the mail has left. I have been distracted since my return by unceasing demands for money, greatly owing to the distressed state of the country. If I were a Crœsus, they would make me bankrupt! Yesterday we had the annual examination of the Kafirs; if you were as well crammed as they were with historical facts, you would be pretty safe! They were bristling with facts in English History from the Romans down to George III., especially the Wars of the Roses and Blenheim's Campaigns. The Clergy here have brought their charges against the Bishop of Natal for false doctrine, and I send them home by this mail. In August I calculate upon starting for a three months' Visitation. I hope that you are taking steadily

[1] He used to take a piece of bread or a bun with him to the vestry for luncheon, and regularly fed the mice with the crumbs. He would put up his finger in warning as some one came in noisily, saying, "Hush! don't frighten away my little mice!"

to work after your ten days' fishing; but keep up your exercise. What an animal you are! I don't think that you ever win a prize for anything but gymnastics! The College here has got its buildings up, and they look tolerably well. There never was before so efficient a staff of teachers connected with any educational establishment in South Africa. I trust that it will rise more and more; but the Oxford young men are really without any definite views, and partake of the general laxity of opinion caused by Jowett and Stanley. There is nothing *positive* in their minds. In the Free State there is a move towards reabsorption in the Colony; they are beginning to petition for it. We have heard nothing from Bishop Tozer and his party since they left. Livingstone is recalled, but I do not believe that he will come back. I like the vignette picture of you better than any other, and fancy that I see a resemblance to your venerable Governor! I have been interrupted about six times while writing these few lines, so you will not be surprised that they are somewhat disconnected.—Ever, my dearest boy (with another interruption), your affectionate father,

"R. CAPETOWN."

To EDWARD GRAY, Esq.

"May 15th, 1863.

"Within an hour we are off on a short Visitation which I am compelled to make, to look after parishes which, during my absence, have been going to the bad. The country is half bankrupt, and I have scarce done anything else than try to defend (not always with success) my hard-earned pittance. One parish to which I gave £50 just before I left, to help half the expense of turning a building into two schoolrooms, spends £288 and sends the whole bill to me! . . . Another writes to say that minister and two parishioners gave a bond for £160 debt upon the Church; the lender is now bankrupt, and they are called to pay; they cannot, will I? Another wants me to lend them on their bond (worth nothing), £400, to build a parsonage. Another, do.; another to build a mission school and chapel. Clergy in debt in several quarters owing to last year's famine

prices and their own indiscretion. In other quarters last winter's heavy rains brought down our Mission buildings; in others, lands bought for Mission stations are bringing in no return; and so I might go on. I hate all this work most thoroughly; but what is to be done? My life is spent in serving tables. The Government deficiency is about £90,000 this year—bankruptcies abound. Parliament, asked to impose taxes, shows a determination to refuse. I am citing Colenso by this mail to appear and take his trial on November 17th. . . Through Brooks, I offer him my house at Kalk Bay. If the Privy Council give a right judgment, everything in Africa will go well. If not, I dread the collisions with P. C. and others, into which, perhaps, I shall be driven. I feel very strongly that duty to Christ forbids our allowing any Civil Court to constitute itself the recognised Court of Appeal in things spiritual. Well—'sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof.' I can write by this mail to no one else. But love to all near and dear to us. Many years of happiness to the younger Essex, who, I suppose, will by this time be married.—Ever, dear Edward, your affectionate brother, R. CAPETOWN."

To CHARLES NORRIS GRAY, Esq.

"Bishop's Court, June 12th, 1863.

. . . "We have just had sad news from the Zambesi. Dear Scudamore, the flower of the party, has been called away; he died January 1st.[1] A fearful famine, the result of a severe drought, has spread over the land, reaching up to Lake Nyassa, and nearly depopulated it. There are bodies floating down the river daily, and the inhabitants of the villages are either starving or dead.

[1] In a letter dated "Chibisa's, January 23rd, 1863, Dr. Dickenson (the physician attached to the Universities Mission) says: "Our much loved brother, the Rev. H. C. Scudamore, was attacked with fever on December 18th . . . . on the 31st, I saw that all hope was gone. He gradually sank, and died January 1st, 1863. I may mention that his health was considerably impaired during the dry season from repeated attacks of fever. The great heat of October and November, and the want of nourishing food, affected him considerably. The absence of flour and wine, and a limited supply of animal food, has affected all of us, and the general physical condition of the party has suffered materially from that cause and the effects of climate." See *Guardian* for July 23rd, 1863.

Their own supply of animal food has quite failed them; our letters of February 24th last say they had only one goat and six fowls left. They had come to the conclusion that if help and animal food did not reach them before June 15th, they must quit the country. It is impossible to say whether the Bishop will reach the Station before they have left. We shall do what we can to send them up food; the Bishop, of course, took a considerable supply with him. He will have an anxious and difficult work before him. On his arrival at Mozambique or Quillimane, he may find them all there. The Diocese of Natal is now addressing me and its Bishop on the subject of his delinquencies. He will find his Clergy repudiating his authority if ever he should go back to the country. Some say outright that they will not worship with him. . . . I hope, my dearest boy, soon to hear that you have got through your additional work and taken your degree, and are thinking seriously of the great work of life, and what God would have you at least attempt to do for Him.—Ever your affectionate father,

"R. CAPETOWN."

To EDWARD GRAY, Esq.

"Bishop's Court, June 14th, 1863.

. . . "I have no alternative but to go on with the Natal case; I *must* hear charges against him, and act according to the best of my judgment, but I have no intention of ever going again in a spiritual cause before the Civil Courts. I will wield spiritual weapons only. Not that I think I did wrong in pleading before them in Long's case. But I then laid down principles by which, I think, I shall abide let the Privy Council decision be what it may. Some of the Clergy of Natal have addressed me in a document which will be published, together with a reply from me, in which I state, historically, the course adopted by them and myself in former cases. Others have addressed the Bishop protesting against his course in claiming to hold office after his avowal, and have forwarded a copy of their address to me. The working up of this case is very laborious. I must do it before I leave for Visitation, and I have

but little time. We have not near worked up arrears yet. You can hardly conceive the kind of appeals made to me almost daily for help from Clergy and laity. The drought, dearness, and poverty of the country are causing very great distress, and it quite makes me miserable to be persecuted as I am. It is easy to polish off mere strangers, but most of these are men with whom I have been connected. . . . I have been threatened again with sleepless nights, from the pressure of anxieties."

The Articles of Accusation alluded to (which are lengthy, and will be found in the Appendix) consisted of extracts from the Bishop of Natal's writings, placed in parallel columns with passages from those formularies of the Church which they were alleged to contravene. They were presented to the Metropolitan with the following letter:—

"To the Most Rev. ROBERT GRAY, D.D., Lord Bishop of Cape Town, and Metropolitan.

"My Lord—We, the undersigned, being Clerks in Holy Orders of the United Church of England and Ireland, and having cure of souls within the Province of Cape Town, under your Lordship's metropolitan jurisdiction, constrained by a sense of duty to the Church within which we hold office, desire to lay before you a charge of false teaching on the part of the Right Rev. John William Colenso, D.D., Lord Bishop of Natal, and a Suffragan Bishop of this Province. The charge which we bring is founded upon certain extracts from writings published and put forth by the Bishop, entitled, etc. etc.

"These extracts are contained in nine schedules, and a copy is hereto annexed, numbered from I. to IX. inclusive. I. With respect to the eight, all and each of them, which stand first, we charge the Bishop of Natal with holding and promulgating opinions which contravene and subvert the Catholic Faith, as defined and expressed in the Thirty-nine Articles, and the formularies of the Book of Common Prayer. And accordingly, under each schedule of extracts we have placed . . . . that which we are persuaded those extracts contravene. II.

With respect to the extracts in Schedule IX., we charge the Bishop of Natal with depraving, impugning, and bringing otherwise into disrepute, the Book of Common Prayer, particularly portions of the Ordinal and Baptismal Services, and in so doing of violating the law of the United Church of England and Ireland, as contained in the thirty-sixth of the Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical. We are deeply conscious of the gravity of these charges, as brought against one who holds the office of a Bishop, and of the responsibility we incur in making them; but the scandal which these publications have caused, and the feelings which are entertained regarding them by the Clergy of the Province generally, seemed imperatively to require that we should lay them before your Lordship, and ask for your judgment upon the doctrines which are therein maintained.

"It only remains for us to inform your Lordship that we are prepared, if required, to prove the charges which we bring; and further, to request that an opportunity may be afforded us of proving them in such time and in such manner as your Lordship may see fit to appoint.

"Dated at Cape Town the 6th, and at Graham's Town the 12th day of May, in the year of our Lord 1863. We are, my Lord, your Lordship's faithful servants,

"H. A. DOUGLAS, Dean of Cape Town.
"N. J. MERRIMAN, Archdeacon of Graham's Town.
"H. BADNALL, Archdeacon of George, and Rector of S. Mark's, George Town.

The responsibility, moral and material, weighed heavily on Bishop Gray, as the following letters will show—

To EDWARD GRAY, Esq.

"Bishop's Court, July 20th, 1863.

"My dear Edward—Many thanks for your offer to do anything about expenses, *in re* Colenso; but I do not see what is to be done. I am already committed to Brooks, Baddely, and Sir R. Phillimore, and I have had to tell Bishop Welby, who

pleads inability to bear the cost of coming, that I will be responsible. I shall have to do the same with the Bishop of the Free State; in addition to the hardship of having to return after having been only a month in his Diocese, he will not be able to bear the expense.

"I have mentioned to the Bishop of Oxford that the law expenses *in re* Long have been very heavy, and that I am behindhand with the world, and if he thinks anything can be done, I am sure he will do it; but if not, I do not care. I cannot make offerings or bear sacrifices in a better cause, and I would willingly go into a cottage if I could, and let my house, or do anything else (for that would be no act of self-denial) to meet these expenses, be they what they may. I believe that we cannot overestimate the importance of this case. If he is tolerated, the Church has no faith, is not a true witness to her Lord. I am prepared to go through anything and endure any loss in defence of the Bible as the Word of God, and of the Faith once for all delivered. I count it a privilege to do so, therefore do not be uneasy about me. The struggle is only just beginning; it will, I foresee in many ways, be full of difficulties. All that I care for is for discernment to see my way aright, and faithfulness to do my duty. Pray that I may have wisdom and courage. There will probably be occasions during and after the trial when I shall be called to act at a critical moment, without much time for thought. I fear this more than anything else, lest at such times I should compromise a great cause, and give a handle to the adversary. However, I shall have the support, God be praised, of *all* the Clergy of our six South African Dioceses. Our names have been cast out these many years for evil by the *Record* and its admirers: it will soon be seen that there is not one among us but what is ready to contend to our last breath for God's Word, and the Faith of the Church which we have sworn to maintain.

If any one is to suffer for Natal, I ought to do so. I was a main instrument in bringing him out here, trusting too implicitly to the judgment of others. But enough of this."

To the Rev. Dr. WILLIAMSON.

"Bishop's Court, July 20th, 1863.

. . . . "I am in for the trial of Natal, and I fear for heavy expenses. Bishop Welby writes word that he fears he cannot come, though most anxious to do so, mainly on the score of expense. . . . It seems to me that the burden and responsibility of dealing with this case rests upon me, and that I may not shrink from it. I should regard myself as a traitor to Christ and His Church, if upon any personal ground whatever I declined the contest to which I am called. The Church of England is no true branch of the Church of Christ, nor is her South African daughter, if either allows one of her Bishops to teach what Natal teaches, and to ordain others to teach the same. If the Faith is committed to us as a deposit, we must keep it at all hazards; and if the world and the courts of the world tell us that we have no power, we must use the power which Christ has given us, and cut off from Him and from His Church avowed heretics, and call upon the faithful to hold no communion with them. We need, I am sure, in these days to ponder well the warnings of our Lord in the Apocalypse to the Seven Churches of Asia. God be praised, not a single Clergyman of any one of the now six Dioceses of this Province sympathises with the Bishop or his views. I believe two holding secular offices in institutions founded by Governor Childe . . . in some measure do. Some laity here and in Natal do,—some have given up attending church since his book was published."

In a letter of the same date to his son, Bishop Gray speaks in greater detail of the difficulties he was placed in through the great expenses in which he was involved, and the personal economies necessary, even to his wife "going without articles of dress which she really needs." And writing to Dr. Williamson (November 12th) he says: "Brooks has written to ask me to draw up an appeal for subscriptions!!! I am not going to send my hat round. If the Church feels that mine is a common burden, and ought not to be borne by me alone, well. If not, I shall feel honoured in being called to make this sacrifice in vindication of my Lord's Person and His Truth."

His departure on Visitation was delayed owing to Bishop Twells not having arrived by the July mail. While waiting to start on the deferred journey in August, he wrote the following letter to his son, who was just leaving Oxford:—

To Charles Norris Gray, Esq.

"Bishop's Court, August 13th, 1863.

"My dearest boy—I must try to write to you before the mail comes in with Bishop Twells, for when it does, I shall have my hands full, with Colenso, Long, the Bishop himself, etc., for this is Thursday, and I leave for three months' Visitation on Monday.

"As the time draws near for you to decide upon Cuddesden or Wells, I have been naturally weighing the matter continually. I confess that my mind is still in the same state as to what is best for you. Though I have not the least desire, my dearest boy, to force your inclination, I think that I should do wrong if I did not tell you what, weighing the matter only with a view to your good, I think would be for the best. I confess that, forming the best judgment that I am able to do, my opinion of Wells is,—that its present chief benefit is from the contemplation of the life and the receiving the counsel of its excellent Principal. It seems to me to want system, and to be deficient in discipline. I believe that you want both of these, and that you would get more of them at Cuddesden than at Wells. The temptation of Oxford to men at Cuddesden I think you over-rate; and if it be a temptation, it is one which it were well to meet bravely at once. The positive advantages of Cuddesden I regard as arising—I. From the greater discipline of the life there. II. From the probable advantage to you in your future life, not in the way of advancement so much as in other ways, of becoming in any degree well known to the Bishop of Oxford. I am sure that, if for my sake alone, he would take an interest in you, and that interest would show itself in your after-life in much thought for you, when perhaps you were least aware of it. It would be a great comfort to me if I lived some years, and you were, as you wish to be, in Eng-

land, to know that my dear friend had you in his eye, and saw something of you; and I think as years roll on, if he and you were spared, you would feel the benefit of it too. It would, I think, really distress him if my son deliberately went away from under his wing. As to Cuddesden men being marked men, I do not believe that it is so, except in a good way, by the most devoted Bishops, and the men of the highest stamp within the Church. Though hating party spirit myself, and having as little taste for Romanisers as for sceptics, I have never through life cared whether people called me a party man or not, and I would advise you to do the same. Do what you believe to be right, and cling to the right, let who will gainsay. Having said thus much, I will leave you to decide for yourself, only begging you to weigh the matter thoroughly, and with prayer for guidance, and then to make arrangements for going to one or the other after Christmas." . . .

Bishop Twells and his Mission party arrived, and remained at Bishop's Court a few days, taking their departure on August 20th, when the Metropolitan started on his Visitation. The same mail brought out the Privy Council's Judgment *in re* Long, the Bishop's reception of which has already been mentioned. It was not a convenient moment in which to leave home; but personal convenience never weighed a moment with Bishop Gray, and he was soon as actively employed in the daily toil and duty of the Visitation as if there were no other claim upon his time and thoughts. Travelling was not all smooth work yet, as the following extract from one of Mrs. Gray's letters to her son will show.

"Knysna, September 11, 1863.

. . . "We went by Worcester, and had cold weather there —snow on the mountains; Robertson, Swellendam, to Riversdale, as fast as we could, in ten days—about 240 miles; then to George, where there was an Ordination; so we stayed five days with the Badnalls. . . . We were not very well off for horses; poor old Ceres, whom I used to ride, was fit only to carry the bags, being very unsafe on her legs . . . and the

poor Bishop had to ride a very rough one. The Archdeacon and Mr. Davidson set off with us. Mr. D. undertook to guide us by a short cut, and brought us down a very steep place through the forest to a narrow but rocky drift, and there he had not an idea which way to go through! The Bishop went first to try, and very soon got into a hole amongst slippery rocks, and his horse was all but down. At last it scrambled out on to a rock in the middle of the water, and he did not know how to get off again. Mr. Davidson then tried wading in up to his middle, but he also slipped about, and had to give it up. Then the Bishop managed to get off the other side of the rock, and by winding about between rocks, found a pretty good path; but when he got to the other side he came out at a wrong place, and again got on a sloping rock, and the horse slipped and fell on his side, very nearly on the Bishop; however, he was only a little bruised, and got up again directly, and then we all followed one by one."

The Bishop writes more particulars from

"Beaufort West, October 9th, 1863.

"My dearest boy—We have a tolerably quiet day or two here, where we are enduring great heat, after equally great cold and rain last week. I have been this time to Victoria, a new village, 100 miles farther to the north than I have ever been before. We shall have a great struggle to plant the Church there, but I think we shall overcome the difficulties. From thence up to the Orange River there is a scattered population of Boers, Kafirs, and Hottentots in the lowest state of degradation. The Boers ill-treat the coloured people, shoot them as they would ostriches, and the coloured people retaliate when they can by murder. Six Hottentots were hung here for murder ten days before my arrival. This state of things extends over hundreds of miles.

"We are now on our way back, having travelled about 1000 miles. I have had more rain than on any previous Visitation, and the whole country is looking well, though the Karroo is the most desolate-looking country. But the small,

dry, dead-looking bush is wonderful pasturage for sheep and oxen. Some farms, 60,000 acres in extent, have from 10,000 to 20,000 sheep. We have had some rough travelling. One night, after going 60 miles with one of the horses tired out, we arrived at a farm which we found deserted; only a Hottentot woman there. She let us in, but there was no food but what we brought; and your mother slept upon a short table, I on a chair without a bottom and the mud floor, in alternate changes. There was a hen and chickens in the room; and we had had nothing all day but some sweet cake and a piece of brown bread which we asked for at the place where we slept before. We had nothing to wash in but a pie-dish; and by two o'clock the next day, when we got to Beaufort, the state of our commissariat was not pleasant.

"I suppose by this time you are just going up for your examination. . . . This work over, and a little recreation had on the Continent or elsewhere, you must begin to grapple with the great work of life. The preliminary stages have lasted longer with you than with most others, for I was anxious that you should have the full benefit of all that the University could do for you. The physical contests have had their place; the intellectual, too, have had their chance; the spiritual must now be entered upon. Read S. Paul's allusions to the Isthmian games, and try to realise with him the words, 'Now they do it to obtain a corruptible crown, but we an incorruptible.' Set this before you steadily for the rest of life. Hitherto you have been training the lower faculties of the man—the flesh—the intellect. The higher must now have the chief share of time and thought. It is with the moral and spiritual nature that man can best serve God and his fellow-men. Graces will do more than gifts for the lifting up of ourselves and others nearer unto God. Now is the time when mere study has ceased to have paramount claims upon you, that the great objects for which man lives, or ought to live, should be pondered, and resolutions formed of giving yourself up wholly to God and His Service. At twenty-three the character should be formed, the mind sobered. We hope to get back in No-

vember, and then comes this unhappy trial, the commencement probably of the greatest struggle that I have ever been engaged in. I fully expect to be in open collision, before it is done, with these Civil Courts, which will, if not curbed, destroy the Church."

From Swellendam the Bishop wrote again (October 26th, 1863) to his son:—"I wish myself to hold the Faith as the Church of England holds and maintains it, having received it from the Catholic and undivided Church, and I should rejoice to see you holding and maintaining it on these grounds and because it is the Catholic Faith. . . . Independently of its great Bishop, I think that Cuddesden has this advantage over Wells, that in it the religious life is more fostered and watched. I think that the mere fact of living together as a College, and not in lodgings as individuals, has its value. May God, my dearest boy, bless your next year to your great good; during it may your faith be deepened, and your views as to the great work in life enlarged. All the past, if kept in due subjection hereafter, will have been of use in strengthening you for the great work and battle of life. Self-discipline is your next lesson; then a deeper faith, and a growing desire to do God service in the world."

After eleven weeks' travelling the Bishop and Mrs. Gray got home again, more knocked up than usual with bad weather, rough accommodation, and want of food. Their journey home from George even was trying, owing to heavy roads, full rivers, horses tired and galled with wet harness, and themselves so thoroughly uncomfortable that the Bishop was detained at Swellendam for two nights quite ill, partly from harass of mind about the sea of trouble to which he was returning. "Then comes the excitement of the Natal trial," he wrote just before this. "Many will consider him persecuted, and sympathise with him because he is a *celebrity*. We must witness for Christ, and purge the Church of deadly heresy, let the consequences to ourselves be what they may. I am quite prepared to find that this case will bring me into direct collision with Civil Courts, and into much personal suffering; but I have counted the cost."

And, November 12th, he writes: "I am now in the thick of the preparations for the Colenso trial. The Bishop of S. Helena has not arrived. Bishop Twells has not come, being detained in the East by floods. We expect him daily. The Bishop of Graham's Town has been with me for some days, and he and I work harmoniously and with thorough mutual confidence at this case for hours daily. The Bishop of Natal denies jurisdiction; says he has taught nothing contrary to the faith of the Church; will appeal. I have a difficult and anxious work before me; the questions very delicate. They combine almost the whole range of theology."

Anxious and difficult work it assuredly was—the very novelty of the whole case, and the apparent uncertainty as to most legal points connected with the matter, adding in no slight degree to the difficulty. Under this vague, unknown condition of the law, Bishop Gray had thought it right to take the best legal opinion he could get as to the extent of his jurisdiction under the letters patent; or, if they were worthless, apart from them by consent, or contract, or the common law of the Church. He was accordingly advised by Dr. Phillimore that, "If the Bishop of Cape Town can bring together all the Bishops of his Province to hear and determine with himself the charges against the Bishop of Natal, and their decision is unanimous, an objection as to the sufficiency of the tribunal will not be allowed to prevail; and with respect to the mode of proceeding, if the Bishop of Natal is duly cited to appear, and the citation appoints a proper time and place, and states the person before whom, as Metropolitan, he is convened, and the charges which he will be called upon to answer, and allows him ample time for preparation, and for reaching the appointed place; and the citation is also shown to have issued from the proper quarter, and with full authority, it seems to me that this will suffice; and that the Courts, whether of England or of the Cape of Good Hope, if the proceedings are brought before them, will not sanction any mere technical objections, when they are satisfied that the rules of justice have been substantially and fully observed. I think that the pro-

ceedings must be taken at Cape Town, or within the Province of the Metropolitan; not in England or in any English Court, nor before any temporal Court in the Colony; and as to the charges or articles which Bishop Colenso is to be called upon to answer, if they are clear, distinct, and pertinent, showing the passages of his works which are alleged to be unsound, and the canons, articles, and formularies of the English Church which they are respectively declared to contravene, so as fully to satisfy all the real merits and justice of the case, they will in all probability be upheld by any Court before which they may hereafter be impugned, notwithstanding some defects of form or minor irregularities which they may exhibit. But the most complete regard to everything which can be deemed matter of substance and importance must be shown, and the most ample means must be afforded to the Bishop of Natal for meeting the charges and for making his defence."

When this opinion was given, the Long Judgment had already been delivered; and, so far from being thought to be any hindrance to the Natal proceedings, it was considered as rather smoothing their way. The letters patent were clearly defective, and Dr. Phillimore said that if the case depended entirely upon them, the Metropolitan would not "have any means of vindicating his authority, or any right to proceed against the Bishop of Natal. . . . But I am of opinion that, notwithstanding their defects, the Bishop of Cape Town may lawfully exercise a control, as Metropolitan, over the Bishop of Natal, and that the Bishop of Natal is amenable to him: this right being grounded not upon any independent and absolute jurisdiction, but upon the actual consent of the Bishop of Natal, and his recognition of Bishop Gray's metropolitical authority."

As we have already seen, the essentials mentioned had been complied with in the carefully-prepared Articles of Accusation and the citation (dated May 18th, 1863) served upon Bishop Colenso. There were further questions pressing upon the Metropolitan, even when it was clear that he both could and ought to proceed. How was he to try the case? Before what Court? How was it to be composed? Was the Metro-

politan to sit alone, as the letters patent implied, or was he to have assessors? and were those assessors to consist of all the Bishops who had taken the oath of obedience to him as Metropolitan, or only of those within the Queen's dominions? Were they to deliver independent judgments? How many were actually necessary to form a Court? and when these questions were decided, how were the proceedings to be conducted? All English law, including, of course, ecclesiastical law, being expressly excluded from the Colony by treaty, how far ought it to govern such proceedings? and who could decide this point? In the absence of any ecclesiastical law suited to this case, how far ought Canon law to take its place? and what was the existing Canon law of the Church of England? how far had it been abrogated or overlaid by subsequent statute law? what might the disestablished Church of Africa appropriate from the Established Mother Church? Again, would the Civil Courts, which loomed in the distance, recognise the African Church as a corporation having laws, or merely as individuals subject to a mutual contract? and if this was all, what was the contract worth? and what did it involve? Had the Metropolitan any greater legal powers in Natal than in the Cape, the constitution of the former being of a later date? Was there any appeal from the Bishops of the Province? and if so, to whom—the Archbishop in person, or in the Court of Arches, or to the Crown?

All these questions pressed heavily on Bishop Gray's mind, feeling as he did that he must act upon certain definite principles, and take a decided line upon every one of them—questions of the most weighty importance to the Church, as he knew them to be.

"It would not have been greatly to be wondered at," he wrote, "if a few Clergy in a distant land, without any great amount of learning or ability, and without the opportunity of consulting any whose opinion ought to guide them on some of the points which they were called to decide, should have made mistakes with regard to questions which have troubled and perplexed the wisest and the most learned; though I am not

aware that we have made any of moment. It may be said, perhaps, that, foreseeing what was coming, I should have fortified myself on such questions as I should have to consider, by counsel with the Fathers of the Church, and of eminent men learned in the law. But this was precisely what I endeavoured to do, though without any great results. Men shrank, amid the uncertainties of the case and the absence of precedents, from giving any clear definite advice, and I left England, after every effort to obtain authoritative and decided counsel, with the conviction that I must act upon my own responsibility; that I must decide the questions which I at least could not avoid, as best I might, and carve out a course for myself. To the Queen's Advocate, indeed, ever ready to lend an attentive ear in any case in which the faith and wellbeing of the Church are concerned, I was indebted for some information, especially respecting the case of Bishop Watson; and I studied that case so far as the imperfect records admitted of, both in the annals of the time, and in the documents preserved at Lambeth. I had hoped, indeed, that this grave cause, affecting as it did the whole Church, might have been taken up by the Bishop of London, who was so much better able to deal with it than myself; and that I might have been spared the labour, anxiety, and responsibility connected with it. I had trusted that it might have been so, because it was publicly stated that the works which had given so great offence having all been published within his jurisdiction, he might bring charges, founded upon them, before the Court of the Archbishops, and thereby obtain a verdict. I know not whether this could have been done, or whether any legal consequences would or could have resulted as regards the Natal letters patent; but, however this may be, the Bishop showed no disposition, at our conference or at any other time, to take active measures, and was most vehement in urging upon me my responsibility in this matter. It was therefore with the greatest reluctance, and moved only by a solemn sense of duty to the Church and to its Head, that I accepted the responsibility which was on all

sides proclaimed to be mine; and in a case so entirely without precedent, adopted the measures which seemed to me to be proper under the circumstances."

Feeling all the weight of this responsibility, the Bishop was preparing for the trial now coming on. Up to the last moment there was doubt about Bishop Twells' arrival. November 16th, Mrs. Gray wrote:

"The trial begins to-morrow. Up to Saturday we were almost in despair. The unusual rains had filled the rivers, and rendered travelling almost impossible, and stopped the posts. Bishop Twells had not been heard of on this side the Orange River, and even the two Archdeacons, whom we thought safe, had not arrived when due. They were to have come from George by post-cart to Swellendam, and there seemed no rivers to stop them, but both passengers and post-carts came in without them. On Saturday afternoon, however, all had arrived. Bishop Twells, after innumerable delays from the weather, had got to Port Elizabeth, just too late for the steamer, but had been most fortunate in getting a return private cart, and coming on immediately. He crossed the Kromma River just before it rose,—the post-cart starting a day and a half later was stopped at it, and half drowned. Bishop Twells has had a dreadful journey—he was upset in the middle of a river, and everything he had soaked. He and the Malay driver crept out, and sat on the overturned cart to consider their next move! . . . At last they managed to right the cart again."

To the BISHOP of OXFORD.

"Bishop's Court, November 16th, 1863.

"My dear Bishop—We begin our sad and solemn work to-morrow. I arrived at home, nearly knocked up with work and bad weather, about ten days ago, and was followed soon by the Bishop of Graham's Town. . . . He and I have talked over every point, and are as nearly of one mind as any two men can be. He approves of all that I mean to say, but while assenting to my judgment upon the several points, would like to give his opinion in his own way. There are questions yet to be dis-

cussed between us, as to the future, which we have not yet worked out. He goes to his task with ability and soundness, and we work together in thorough harmony. . . . We are all, thank God, well, and in good heart, and feeling we are defending the Person and the Truth of our Lord."[1]

The Metropolitan's assessors having duly arrived, on November 17th, according to the citation, the trial began. It was held in S. George's Cathedral, a space before the altar being set apart for the purpose, and as, of course, the trial was public, it was attended by a very considerable number of people. The Metropolitan presided, assisted by the Bishops of Graham's Town and Orange Free State. Dean Douglas of Cape Town, and Archdeacons Merriman and Badnall, were present as accusers, and Bishop Colenso had sent Dr. Bleek, the Curator of the Gray Library (a German and a known unbeliever) to be present as his personal friend and protest against the proceedings.

The Bishop of Cape Town having mentioned the presentation of articles and citation, declared himself ready to hear the charges, together with the other Bishops present, and called upon the Registrar to read the citation[2] and charges. The letter of presentation was then read, followed by the articles of accusation.[3] Certain documents[4] having also been read, Dr. Bleek read a letter from Bishop Colenso, according to his instructions. The letter (which was dated London, October 23, 1863), after acknowledging the receipt of the citation, went on to say: "I am advised that your Lordship has no jurisdiction over me, and no legal right to take cognisance of the charge in question. I therefore protest against the proceedings instituted before you, and request you to take notice that I do

[1] It must be remembered that this was not like an ordinary criminal trial, in which evidence, hitherto not known, might be brought forth. The Judges thoroughly knew the whole case, the books containing the heresies they condemned, and their position as militating against the Faith. There was no prejudging in coming to the case thus. Bishops of the Church of Christ, of course, could not but have their minds distinctly made up upon the questions about to come before them, before hearing the case. The only opening for uncertainty was the possibility of Bishop Colenso withdrawing or retracting his utterances. [2] Appendix II. [3] Appendix III. [4] Appendix IV.

not admit their legality, and that I shall take such measures to contest the lawfulness of your proceedings, and, if necessary, to resist the execution of any judgment adverse to me which you may deliver, as I shall be advised to be proper. My absence from the Cape will make it impossible for me to know what view your Lordship may take of your jurisdiction till long after your decision has been announced, and I have no desire to cause any unnecessary delay in the settlement of this matter, such as would be produced if I were to confine myself to a mere protest against your jurisdiction. I therefore think it better to state at once the answer which—if you have any jurisdiction in the matter—I have to make to the charge brought against me.

"I admit that I published the matter quoted in the articles annexed to the citation, but I claim that the passages extracted be read in connection with the rest of the works from which they are taken; and I deny that the publication of these passages, or any of them, constitutes any offence against the laws of the United Church of England and Ireland."

Bishop Colenso then referred to a letter of his, written in or about May 1861, containing some replies to objections raised by the Metropolitan to his writings, going on to say: "I have instructed Dr. Bleek, of Cape Town, to appear before your Lordship on my behalf for the following purposes:—

"I. To protest against your Lordship's jurisdiction.

"II. To read this letter, of which I have sent him a duplicate, as my defence, if your Lordship should assume to exercise jurisdiction.

"III. If you should assume jurisdiction, and deliver a judgment adverse to me, to give you notice of my intention to appeal from such judgment."

The Metropolitan here observed, that if Dr. Bleek wished to argue in support of the Bishop of Natal's first exception, on jurisdiction, this was the time to do it. Dr. Bleek replied that his instructions were merely to protest, and he accordingly handed in his protest.[1]

[1] Appendix V.

The Dean of Cape Town then spoke, touching first upon the reluctance with which he undertook the office of an accuser; which, however, having been forced upon him, in virtue of his office, by the Clergy of the western section of the Diocese, he did because he could not help it, with a sure hope that the Lord he desired to serve would help him in his task, and a prayer as earnest as the heart of man could offer that every word he spoke might be chastened with the Spirit of Wisdom, and serve nothing but the pure and simple ends of truth. The Dean explained that his co-accusers were in a like position, the Archdeacon of George being present at the request of that Archdeaconry, and representing the Clergy thereof; and the Archdeacon of Graham's Town as proxy for that Diocese. Natal took no part, not out of any sympathy with the opinions of its Bishop, all the Clergy repudiating them, but out of delicacy. "We have come here, not to trifle, or so speak smooth things," the Dean said. "We charge a Bishop with that which the Church has called heresy, and we believe that we can prove that charge."

Referring to the nine charges, the Dean ranged them into two classes—the first, of errors on the subject of man's recovery from ruin; the second, of errors pertaining to the doctrine of Scripture as God's Word.

With respect to the first of these subjects, the Dean urged that, in order to a clear discrimination of the Bishop of Natal's meaning, it was important to look at the truths under discussion from his point of view. What that point of view was seemed to admit of no doubt. The references to "modern dogma," and the "dogma of modern theology;" the allusions to Paradise Lost, and the general tone and scope of the whole Commentary, indicated that the author's mind was occupied, as it were, in a recoil from some real or imaginary school of theology which seems to represent the Almighty as a severe and vindictive Being Who took pleasure in the punishment of His Son, and thus to exhibit the redemption of the human race as a concession wrung from an unwilling and arbitrary ruler who was forced to recognise the claims of justice, rather than

as an act of sovereign mercy which had its primal origin in God's Paternal Love. While fully acknowledging Love to be the crowning attribute in that Mysterious Entity which we, after our human fashion, describe as the Divine Character, the Dean believed those whom he addressed would also say with Bishop Butler that the Author of Creation shows Himself to us as a Moral Governor Who is both Righteous and Just; that, to quote the great Bishop, "God's whole Nature is one great impulse to what, upon the whole, is best." Moreover, it would be admitted that man must not be wise beyond what is revealed for his guidance, and that truth is to be found by weighing Scripture against Scripture, doctrine against doctrine, with scrupulous exactness, giving to each its due place and relative importance. He thought it was a deficiency in this patient investigation, in this quiet self-restraint of mind, which can bear long with difficulty and obscurity, content to wait and see mistily until the light breaks and the dimness vanishes, which had led to the errors now under consideration. The Bishop denied the existence of that wondrous harmony of truth and mercy which Scripture teaches us to have led to man's Redemption. In his opinion God is absolute Benevolence, which, however great it sounds, will on closer consideration prove to be only another name for absolute weakness. God is so Love as to be Love only; and in accordance with this the Bishop put forth a string of opinions which stripped from the Atonement its satisfying, vicarious, and propitiatory character; removed faith from its position as the introduction to a state of salvation; took all use and virtue from the Sacraments, denied the existence of a Church, and did away with Hell.

"I am conscious," the Dean said, "of the strength of the language I am about to use; but I cannot refrain from asserting at the outset of my argument that opinions such as these are something more than heresy. Upon the plea of showing forth the love of God our Father, the Bishop has put forth a wild though mystic and alluring scheme of blind benevolence, which is subversive of all that is generally known as Christianity. Professing to show us that God is all love, he represents

Him as indifferent to evil; and maintains that our Lord was sent here, not to die for sin and bear it for us, but only to cheer and encourage us in our efforts for our own deliverance; to show us, indeed, the way to God, but not to propitiate His Father's anger, for there never was any real separation between man and God."

Here the Archdeacon of Graham's Town interrupted with the question, as to Dr. Bleek, whom he had never seen before, whether he were a member of the Church of England, or of any communion which would recognise its formularies, on which all the argument was founded? The Archdeacon of George endorsed the query, adding, that though neither had he ever seen Dr. Bleek before, having lived so much in Cape Town, he had heard of him, as not only not a member of the Church, but as very well known to sympathise in the very strongest way with quite the freer sort of Socinianism. The question being formally put to Dr. Bleek, he declined to answer, and the Dean proceeded to deal with the opinion set forth concerning the Atonement by Bishop Colenso. Referring to a passage in the Commentary (section 144), which probably he would select as the fullest expression of the light in which he viewed our Lord's Sacrifice, the Dean said that in itself he did not quarrel with it. Taking it as describing one aspect of that mysterious and many-sided doctrine, he was rather disposed to admire the beauty of its language, and to rejoice in the fervour of its thought. Had it stood alone it might have seemed insufficient, but no one would have cavilled at it; but taken together with other passages (to be found in the Articles of Accusation), no one could help believing that it was intended as a complete exposition of our Lord's Atoning Sacrifice, and that the author meant emphatically to deny that His Sufferings were vicarious, or that any act of His was needed to satisfy the Father before He could forgive the world its sin. Bishop Colenso denied again and again that our Lord died in our stead. He died on our behalf, to express and display His boundless sympathy, but not to bear our sins, or the weight of our curse. The Bishop will not allow it to be said that God was reconciled

to us, because that implies anger before reconciliation, which never existed. "He regards the doctrine that our Lord died instead of man as a modern dogma; and, not objecting to the novelty—for that, I imagine, would not offend, as the antiquity, most assuredly, is not the ground on which he seeks to recommend his own opinion—he asserts, with a boldness which is astounding, that the dogma finds no colour for itself in Holy Scripture, and that there is no ground for thinking that God could require to be reconciled . . . because He never had any wrath to be appeased."

Observing that the present Court was not a sphere for discussing questions of grammar and exegesis, and that the duty of the Bishops sitting there was not to arrive at truth by immediate deduction from Scripture, but rather by taking the results at which the Church has already arrived, and which are binding upon her members as a test, the Dean entered upon certain critical points, showing that Bishop Colenso's Greek was faulty, and going on to deal with the charge of novelty, as alleged against the doctrine of vicarious suffering. It is with a real burst of eloquence that he exclaims: "I maintain that this dogma is even more than apostolic. It is as old as Revelation. It has been believed from the days of Adam to our own day. Seen as in a glass, darkly, in prophecy, in figures, in types and ceremonies by patriarchs and Jewish saints, it has been clearly recognised in the Christian Church as the essential counterpart of the doctrine of our Lord's Divinity, and as a truth which cannot be denied by any who will not, sooner or later, proceed to deny also that Jesus is the Son of God. Dogma of modern theology! I protest against the libellous insinuation. I appeal to every offering for sin which ever burnt upon a Jewish altar; I appeal to the Creeds of the Church; I appeal to the Liturgies of Christendom, to the Fathers of the first and every age; and to the sign of the Cross, so early used as the type and symbol of our Faith; and I affirm, as I believe I can also prove, that the life and existence of the Church, both Jewish and Christian, has turned upon belief in Christ's vicarious Death as its moving spring and cardinal principle.

It has always been believed. The Church of the early centuries believed it; the Churches of the middle ages believed it; it is believed by the Church now!"

Going on to show how the Church has ever understood the terms "propitiation" and "satisfaction;" how the ancient liturgies and our own use them; how the Fathers used them, and that the truths they embody are part of that inheritance of faith which should be as dear to us as life, while the denial of them can only be termed rank heresy;—the Dean proceeded to show that on the difficult question of justification the Bishop of Natal differed from all schools of opinion, and completely contravened the articles and formularies of the Church of England. According to his commentary, all men, Christians, Jews, Turks, stand upon the same level before God. There is no real difference between them, all are justified. God's gift of righteousness was from the first bestowed upon them, etc. What then, it seems only natural to ask, is the good of being a Christian? What the difference between Christian and heathen? Bishop Colenso answers that the Christian knows more, is conscious of his privileges, and has a present joy in God; that in actual state and condition there is no difference between a Christian and an infidel; both are regenerate, both members of Christ—both belong to God's family, and have received the gifts of righteousness; but the heathen is, for the present, in darkness; in short, that all the Christian gets from Christianity, the Church, the Sacraments, or the gift of the Spirit, is clearer *knowledge*, and consequent joy and peace. But such knowledge, severed from all grace, is purely intellectual, and if we talk of Gnostics in early days, surely we have Gnosticism here!

The Dean next showed the faulty teaching of the Bishop of Natal as to the Sacraments, asserting, as he did, that man's "new birth unto righteousness" takes place, not in Baptism, but in "his very birth-hour," when they are joined to Christ and made members of His body through grace. Baptism, according to him, is only the sign or test proving to them that they had had this new birth. And with respect to the Holy Eucharist, the Bishop taught that the gift of Christ's Body and

Blood is given to us not only in the Sacrament, but at all times and to all men, whether Christians or not, with or without faith, knowing and valuing, or ignorant of and despising it. "If his view is at all correct" (the Dean said), "the most sacred ordinance of our faith is in no way needful to salvation. He teaches that the grace of that Sacrament is independent of the Sacrament. Jew, Turk, and infidel feed upon it; men who are steeped in every sin constantly partake of it. Men who have faith receive this grace, but men who have no faith equally possess it; men who know about it have this precious gift, but men without knowledge have it also." The Dean believed the Bishop of Natal incapable of a wilful outrage upon decency, but he could not look upon the publication of such opinions as other than defiling the most sacred rite of our religion, and dragging it through the mire. Of course such a theory does away with any meaning in the assertion of the Eucharist being "generally necessary to salvation." The *sufficiency* of the Atonement is one thing, the efficiency to save all another; and universal salvation is as clearly contrary to every line of Holy Scripture, as universal redemption is written in light on every page.

The denial of eternal punishment was the fourth charge into which the Dean went at length, setting forth both the unquestionable affirmation of the doctrine by Holy Scripture and the Church of all ages; and its denial by the Bishop of Natal, together with his bold assertion of the "absolute wickedness" of the clauses contrary to his opinion in the Athanasian Creed, and his disagreement with Article VIII.

The Dean summed up the day's argument as follows:—

"I have shown that on each of four important questions the Bishop has been guilty of publishing opinions which overthrow and contradict the Faith. My Lords, if but on one of these points his teaching had been heretical, the keys of discipline which your Great Head has placed in your keeping must have been turned against him, to shut him out from his exalted privileges, unless, by God's Grace, he should recant his error and return to the way of truth. What, then, when your brother is in error upon all? From the Atonement of our Divine Lord he

takes away propitiation, denying that the sin of man was borne upon the Cross. He makes that virtuous habit of faith which goes before righteousness a mere feeling which is unintelligent and follows righteousness. He confuses between grace and nature in the spirit of a pure Pantheist, and, to use the language of Holy Scripture, he throws the children's bread, which God gives to His own in Sacraments, to dogs and swine. And then, having thus made void the mystery of man's redemption, whether we look to the objective side of Christ's work or to the subjective side of man's reception, he walks from time and sense into the world invisible, and confuses all our thoughts of Heaven and Hell. What are we to think of such theology as this? Is it possible to look calmly on and permit a Bishop of the Church to teach this new and strange doctrine, which does not only undermine the Faith, but saps the very foundations of society, and makes sin nothing while it boastfully proclaims the Love of God? My Lords, it is no pleasure to me thus to accuse one whom, for his office, I should venerate, as for much that is in him I admire as a man. But in these days, when truth is often held too cheap, and zeal for truth undervalued, it may be well to remember that S. Paul himself could say anathema on one who preached another gospel. . . . I maintain, my Lords, that the truth from which your brother has fallen is part of Christ's Gospel. I contend that he has denied the Faith."

November 18th the Court sat again, and the Dean resumed his argument, dealing with the Bishop of Natal's views of Holy Scripture, concerning which we have already seen what was the opinion of the whole English Episcopate. The Dean set forth how the Church has ever regarded the Bible, and wherein the Bishop's language contradicts its teaching generally, as well as that of the formularies of our English Church. The whole speech (too long to be quoted here) is strikingly clear and interesting, and leaves it beyond any doubt (had Dr. Colenso himself not expressly stated his dissent) that the Bishop of Natal rejected the doctrines affirmed by the Prayer-book, and had done as much

to "hinder and slander God's Word"[1] as any one could well do. He then proceeded to follow out the strange and sad results which end in charging the Blessed Saviour Himself with ignorance and error in quoting Holy Scripture as He did." "The Bishop says that our Lord was wrong—wrong upon a matter of which He spoke continually—wrong, too, upon things pertaining to His Own Book. . . . The Bishop teaches that He Whom we believe to be the Author of the Bible was ignorant both of the substance and the sources of the Book. And if our Lord was wrong in this, where was He right? What are His words worth? when can we trust Him? where shall we follow Him? Is it for such an One as this that Apostles forsook all, that saints lived, that martyrs died? Has this mistaken Person changed the world, revived society, restored humanity? . . . Men who teach thus destroy the faith of others; can we believe that they have any faith themselves?"

The conclusion of the Dean's speech re-echoes the opinion already so strongly expressed by the Bishops of London, S. David's, and others, as to the absolute necessity of Dr. Colenso's resigning his office.[2] The Bishop was bound by his office, not only to respect the Liturgy, but to see that others did so too; yet he taught others not to use it. Again and again he had committed himself to promises and obligations which ought to make it sacred to him; and if his opinions were so changed that he could not use it, one might lament the change, but all would respect the man who left the Church he could no longer hold to. But Bishop Colenso renounced his belief, not his position. He abandoned the Bible and Prayer-book, of which his office made him the guardian, and yet retained that office. If he had boldly said: "I leave the Church, I shake off the

[1] See Exhortation in Communion Service.

[2] See p. 46, meeting of Bishops (February 1863). Bishop Thirlwall said it was absolutely impossible that Bishop Colenso should remain in the Church of England, his position was utterly untenable, etc.

See also Part III. Pentateuch: Preface, p. xxii., where Dr. Colenso wrathfully quotes the Bishop of London's statement in his charge that "if inquiry led to doubt, and if the doubt ended in disbelief of the Church's doctrines, of course he would resign his office as one of the Church's authorised teachers."

dust of my feet against a body which I despise;" we should at least feel that he was acting honestly. But, as the Dean said, instead of that, he stands within the Church itself, mutilating and tearing out the pages he had sworn to use and defend. "These things which we believe, and which we weave into our solemn prayers, what are they? 'Fictions, transparent fictions!' The Bishop almost says,—'Is there a fool on earth who can believe them?' Be it so. But then the Bishop's office is a fiction, all the institutions of the Church are fictions, the Cathedrals which our fathers built are fictions, the history of Christendom is a fiction: I might say the Christian world is one great fiction. But certainly, if these things are fictions, the Bishop of Natal is part of this system of imposition; and if he loves truth as he professes to love it, he should have left this state of fiction, and taken up his place among true and living things. . . .

"Speaking on behalf of my brother Clergy, who with one mind and one mouth repudiate and reject these novel doctrines, these strange contradictions of revealed and unalterable truth, I ask you, without fear or favour, without regard to man and man's opinion, with an eye singly fixed on that Divine Person Who, as He reigns upon His Throne above, watches the work which is now proceeding, and the judgment which this Court will pronounce,—before Him our God, I ask you to put in force those sacred laws which you are pledged and commissioned to administer, and though the person accused is a Bishop and your brother, to award that sentence which is right and just." [1]

That afternoon and the next morning (November 19th) Archdeacon Merriman addressed the Court. He said that he was anxious to press on the attention of the Court what he believed to be the fact,—that, never since the foundation of

[1] November 19th the Metropolitan wrote to the Bishop of Oxford:

"The Dean has made a most powerful, a noble address. In point of oratory, eloquence, grasp of subject, analysis of the Bishop's system, clearness of style, soundness of theology, it is a very remarkable production. . . . He has risen to the occasion, and surprised us all by coming out beyond what we deemed his powers. It is the opinion of us all that there are very few men in England who could have delivered such an address."

Christendom, was any individual, heretic or false teacher, cited to appear on so wide and multifarious a field of erroneous doctrine as that which it had been necessary to charge the Bishop of Natal. This point was important to observe, because, however much uncertainty there might be in attempting to fix the meaning of certain theological phrases used inconsistently or erroneously by the Bishop,—however much his accusers might misunderstand him or be baffled in their attempts to explain his meaning, the cumulative weight of argument to be drawn from so great and multifarious a mass of false teaching is really irresistible. Nearly all the great heresies condemned in ancient times, and considered in the first four General Councils, are implied;—and a denial by implication of our Lord's Divine Nature, or of the perfection of His Human Nature, seems necessarily to lie at the root of much thereof. "And the free handling of the Holy Scriptures, after the manner of Socinus and his followers, culminates at length in the Bishop of Natal's writings in such fearful statements regarding our Blessed Lord, that we hardly know under what class to reckon such heresy, even when running over the names of the copious brood of them which sprang up in the sixth century."

Later on the Archdeacon alluded to the "appalling" nature of the calm threat that the same spirit of inquiry will be carried into the writings of the New Testament.[1] He might well have said that one who could offer so grievous insult to our Lord in His Sacred Humanity, was not likely to hold His written Gospel in any special reverence. Having committed the judgment "calmly, confidently, and prayerfully" to the Bishops, he concluded, saying: "May God defend the right."

Archdeacon Badnall next spoke, reminding the Court that he appeared as the representative of every Clergyman in the

[1] "But it is said, 'the same spirit of inquiry will be carried into the writings of the New Testament.' I answer, Undoubtedly it will and must be; and if there is any part of the Church's teaching, depending on the New Testament, which will not bear the test of truth, we shall of course, as servants of the God of Truth, be bound to reject that also. Is there, then, a 'dark chamber' here too, which we are afraid to examine,—into which we dare not suffer the light of day to enter?"—Preface to Part III. of the *Pentateuch*, p. 40.

Archdeaconry of George. His speech, which was continued on November 20th, necessarily travelled over the same ground as that on which his predecessors had dwelt, though perhaps it was more elaborate, and went with greater minuteness into the various issues, occupying upwards of eight hours. This closed the case for the prosecution, and the Bishop of Cape Town called upon the Registrar to read a letter[1] addressed to himself by the Bishop of Natal, August 7th, 1861, defending his *Commentary on the Romans*, concerning which the Bishop had written, as before mentioned, entreating him not to publish it. In this letter the Bishop of Natal thanks his Metropolitan "sincerely" for that which he had written, saying: "I cannot be surprised at your writing so earnestly and seriously, holding the views which you do on some of the points which I have discussed. But as you will have learnt from my last letter, it is too late now to stop the publication of the book, even if I desired to do so. Whatever you may think right to say or do in the matter, I am quite sure that you will only act from a sense of duty to what you believe to be the truth, which compels you to set aside all personal feelings, in obedience to a higher law. In writing what I have written, and publishing it, I too have done the same, though conscious that I should thereby cause pain to yourself and others, whom I entirely esteem and love. It is true that you have mistaken some of my expressions; others—forgive me for saying it—you seem to me to have misjudged. But in respect of others, I am well aware that my views differ strongly from yours." . . .

One cannot but grieve that Dr. Colenso did not remember this his certain belief, and that but a short time after (doubtless under the irritation of deserved censure and the estrangement of all holding the one True Faith of Christ) he should so wantonly and inconsistently have accused his Metropolitan of the very reverse—of unfairness, personal feelings, and the like!

The Bishop of Natal's letter having been read, the Bishop of Cape Town inquired of Dr. Bleek whether there was any-

[1] Appendix VI.

thing he wished to say on behalf of his principal. Upon that gentleman refusing to do anything beyond the strict fulfilment of his instructions, "to protest and read a letter and give notice of an appeal," the Dean suggested that, as the Bishop of Natal's letter was put in as his defence, and that having been carefully written some years before, it seemed due to him amply to weigh his explanation, and therefore the Dean proposed that time should be given to consider the letter, and to make such remarks upon it as might seem called for.

Accordingly, on November 21st, when the Court met again, the Dean, after expressing the regret felt by all at the Bishop of Natal's absence, and the satisfaction it would have given had he himself said what he could in his own defence, went on to say that, as matters stood, they must of course accept his letter as containing the substance of all he would have said. It was evidently written with great care;—the expressions were well weighed, and it entered with great particularity into some of the very points raised; but the Dean must add that he and his colleagues felt that, instead of in any degree weakening their case, or refuting their arguments, it did but confirm and strengthen them on many of the most important points. This letter contained the seed of the Bishop's later writings upon the Pentateuch. The Dean then went through the chief points of Bishop Colenso's letter, showing how it in fact epitomised his erroneous opinions, ending with the expression of a hope that, when the Bishop saw the inevitable alternative before him of either charging God with error, or allowing that his own theory of the Bible was mistaken, he would reconsider the latter, and allow that there must be a mistake somewhere, although he might not be able at once to perceive where. The Dean trusted that this *reductio*—not *ad absurdum*, but *ad profanum*—would lead him to see his error and reject it.

The case being closed, the Metropolitan said that he and his assessors must, of course, take time to go into the whole case and its most important evidence before giving judgment, and the Court separated. Many hours of patient, anxious

study and investigation were bestowed upon the matter by the three Prelates assembled at Bishop's Court; and, finally, December 14th, the Court sat to hear the opinions of the assessors. Dr. Bleek received due notice, but he did not attend. The Bishop of Graham's Town first gave his opinion, going clearly and forcibly into the charges, examining them by the Formularies of the Church of England, as taken in their usual and literal sense, rather than by the writings of theologians—the object of the investigation being to determine whether the Church, of which the Bishop of Natal was an authorised minister, condemned or allowed the doctrines which he had set forth. On each of the nine charges, the Bishop's opinion was that it was clearly proved. After delivering this opinion as to the charge affecting Bishop Colenso's teaching upon the Sacraments, he said: "I have examined the Bishop's explanations on this subject and the whole of this charge against him with the more care, because of the diversity of opinion which exists among members of our own Church as to the meaning of the Church's teaching respecting Sacraments. But it appears that the Bishop contradicts truths in which all schools of theology agree, and that his opinions are wholly outside the limits of the questions discussed between them."

Probably any one who desired fully to understand the history of this most grievous passage of Church history, in so far as a clear setting forth of the obnoxious and heretical teaching of Bishop Colenso, its unquestionable opposition to the faith of Christ's Church, and the answers with which, to all honest and logical minds, it is utterly refuted, would nowhere find what they needed more clearly and ably summed up in the Bishop of Graham's Town's opinion, than anywhere; and those who will study its clear definite sentences will not fail to come to his conclusion—that "the Bishop of Natal's arguments are not consistent with any creed that teaches the Divinity of our Blessed Lord, except that which is condemned by the Church as Nestorianism;" and that his "teaching does deprave, impugn, and bring into disrepute the Book of Common Prayer, as he is charged with doing." The concluding words of the opinion

are as follows: . . . "These charges have included questions from the whole range of theology; they have not referred to a few isolated opinions which might be held without any departure from that faith which by his office in the Church the Bishop is pledged to maintain and set forward; they have affected the gravest and most fundamental principles of revealed truth. Whatever latitude of opinion may be allowed, and ought to be allowed, within the limits marked out by our Church, the Bishop, so far as I can judge, has transgressed these limits in regard to every one of these charges. I see no way of escaping this conclusion if the standards of our Church are to have any definite meaning. If the Bishop's is not false and heretical teaching, I know not what teaching could be condemned as such. Sometimes by express words, and always by the conclusions which follow from his words, he contradicts those standards to which he has bound himself. With regard also to some of the opinions held by the Bishop, I cannot overlook the fact that the offence of promulgating error is aggravated by the spirit, reckless of all consequences to the faith of the young and the unstable, in which opinions, unsound in themselves, are pushed forward to conclusions subversive of all faith in Divine Revelation. The opinions are maintained in full view, as it seems to me, of the result to which they point, and they cannot, therefore, be excused on the plea of any unconsciousness on the part of the writer of the tendency of these speculations. I cannot but conclude that, by the false teaching proved against him, the Bishop has wholly disqualified himself—unless he shall now openly retract and revoke this his false teaching—for bearing rule in the Church of God, and for the cure of souls therein; and that he cannot, consistently with the laws of our Church, unless he shall thus retract his errors, retain any longer the office of Bishop of Natal."

The Bishop of the Free State next proceeded to give his opinion. He pointed out that it was not a question of words, but of most important doctrine throughout, and that doctrine not containing matters of ordinary theological controversy, or involving opinions held by any of the special schools of religious

thought existing, but teaching opinions strange to all alike. Going through the various schedules, he pointed out the error into which the Bishop of Natal had fallen in saying that "Protestants only were the small majority among Christians who held the dogma of everlasting punishment, inasmuch as no doctrine of purgatory has ever interfered with the uniform teaching of the whole Catholic Church in all ages, according to the literal words of the Athanasian Creed." The purification of Purgatory has ever been held to apply to those who are saved, in contradistinction to those who are lost. The Bishop having given it as his opinion also that each of the charges had been proved, the Metropolitan proceeded to appoint December 16th as the day when judgment would be delivered.

Accordingly on that day the Bishop of Cape Town gave his judgment. He began by saying that the case was one of the gravest and most painful character. That a Bishop should be formally accused of heresy was a circumstance happily almost unknown among us since the Reformation, absolutely so among the non-established Colonial Churches; and thus to the African Church was attached the reproach of being the first to be charged with a wide departure from the faith in the person of one of her prelates. The absence of all precedent added greatly, the Metropolitan observed, to the difficulty of dealing with a case so distressing under all aspects to the Bishops of the Province, called to sit in judgment on one who had been their fellow-labourer so long, and with whom they had lived in friendly counsel and brotherly intercourse. After glancing at the question of his own jurisdiction as disputed by the Bishop of Natal, he went on to consider whether the charges brought against him had been proved, and whether they were such as to warrant the conclusion at which the Metropolitan and his assessors had arrived.

"In forming a decision as to the soundness or unsoundness of the Bishop's views," he said, "I shall be guided entirely by the language of the Articles and Formularies, including, of course, the whole Book of Common Prayer. I do not mean thereby to imply that these are the only tests by which the

Bishops of this Church should try the teaching of its Ministers. I am of opinion that the decisions of those Councils which the Church of England regards as Œcumenical are the very highest authorities by which they could be guided; and the received faith of the Church of all ages, even if not defined by any Council, if it can be ascertained—as, for example, on such a question as Inspiration in connection with the Holy Scriptures—must also be a guide to them which cannot be disregarded. In the present case, however, though I may refer to these authorities as illustrating and confirming the doctrine of the Church of England, and compare the Bishop's teaching with them, I shall not base my judgment upon them, because the presenting Clergy have not, in their articles, referred to them, but have contrasted the Bishop's language exclusively with the Articles and Formularies of the Church of England. I do not feel called upon to estimate, with precision, the amount of authority to be attached to each of the documents which the Church of England has stamped with her authority . . . but . . . it may be enough to say, that while regarding them all in their several measures and degrees as utterances of the Church's voice, I regard the three Creeds as of the highest authority, because they express the mind and faith, not only of the Church of England but also of the whole Catholic Church from the beginning. That I consider the Articles as next in authority to the Creeds . . . and that I regard the whole Prayer-book, more especially the Catechism, the Ordination Services, and services for Holy Baptism and Holy Communion, as of great authority; and as sufficient to show what the faith of the Church is on matters upon which the Articles may be silent, or their language require explanation. I shall, without assuming to decide upon the extent of authority to be attached to the language of the Homilies, refer to them as authorised expositors of the more condensed language of the Articles, and as illustrating their meaning, but I shall not use them as an independent authority. . . I shall not refer largely to the writings of those generally considered as the great divines of the Church; and when I do so, it will be for the purpose of illustrating the Church's teaching, not as inde-

pendent authorities. If there are any who are entitled to rank as authorities, Jewell and Nowell pre-eminently are so, because of the sanction given by Convocation to certain of their writings; but even these will be used only for the purpose of explanation and illustration.

"In interpreting the Church's standards of faith, I shall endeavour to ascertain their 'true, usual, literal, plain, and full meaning?' Wheresoever it is possible, I shall decide this by the 'literal and grammatical sense' of the words.[1] Where the sense of the words is not plain, where they are theological words, and have an historical meaning, I shall interpret them by a comparison of passages; by the history of the controversies which gave rise to them, by the analogy of the Faith. I shall always have regard, when this is possible, to the *animus imponentis,* the intention of the Church in the wording of its documents.

"This course appears to me to be the fairest, both to the Bishop and to the Church. The Creeds, Articles, Formularies, and Book of Common Prayer are the documents to which he has given his assent, by which he has acknowledged himself to be bound, and in accordance with which he has pledged himself to teach, and affirms in his defence that he has taught. In common with all engaged in these proceedings, I deeply regret that the Bishop was not himself present on the occasion of the trial." . . .

Proceeding to take the charges one by one, the Metropolitan dealt first with the charge against the Bishop of Natal of maintaining that our Lord did not die in man's stead, or bear the punishment of our sins, and that God is not reconciled to us by the Death of His Son. Bishop Colenso's writings distinctly affirm that "there is not a single passage in the whole of the New Testament which supports the dogma of modern theology that our Lord died for our sins, in the sense of dying instead of us; dying in our place, or dying so as to bear the punishment or penalty of our sins." He had gone carefully through the *Commentary* and through the letter of August 1861, put forth by the Bishop of Natal, as at once an exposition and a defence of his views, to see whether the above and similar

[1] Declaration prefixed to the Articles.

expressions were incidental, not supported by the general tone of the book, but modified and corrected elsewhere, inasmuch as the writer did not always express himself accurately or exactly when treating of the great mysteries of the Faith, and not unfrequently used language inconsistent with itself. The result was that much might be quoted which did not seem so at variance with the teaching of the Church concerning the Atonement as to call for condemnation if taken alone. But, unhappily there were other passages which proved that he used the words atonement, redemption, sacrifice, satisfaction, and propitiation, all of which may be called ecclesiastical and historical words, in a sense of his own, different to that in which the Church uses them, and repudiating some of the truth they teach. Instances of this were quoted, such as "It is very unfortunate that the true meaning of the word Atonement . . . should be so commonly lost sight of, and the notion introduced of something paid down to atone, as it is said, or compensate to God, or at least to reconcile God to us for our sins" (*Comm.* p. 98). Other instances followed: Thus of satisfaction the Bishop of Natal wrote, "I do deny that this was a vicarious sacrifice, in the sense in which I understand you to use the words, namely that He endured in our stead the weight of God's wrath; He bore the penalty of our sins. I believe that neither the expression nor the idea is Scriptural." Again, "I repeat the assertion, there is not a single expression in the whole New Testament, which distinctly implies that Christ suffered the weight of His Father's wrath in our stead." "He bore our sins, not the penalty of our sins." . . . "He paid this debt, not in our stead. . . . He did not bear the weight of the curse. He did not suffer the accumulated weight of woe due as a punishment for the sins of the world." These and similar passages establish the assertion that throughout the Bishop of Natal shrank from and repudiated substitution.

The Metropolitan proceeded to show from the Office for Holy Communion, from the IInd and XXXIst Articles and Homilies, that Bishop Colenso was not justified in denying that "our Lord died for our sins in the sense of dying instead of us, or dying so as to bear the penalty or punishment of our sins;" as

also that he in so many words denied the assertion of Article II. that "Christ, Very God and Very Man, truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile His Father to us."

The second charge was that the Bishop of Natal maintained justification to be a consciousness of being righteous, and that all men, even without such consciousness, are treated by God as righteous, and counted righteous; and that all men, as members of the great human family, are dead unto sin and risen again unto righteousness. After quoting passages containing this teaching, the Metropolitan said:

"The question for me to decide is whether this teaching is consistent with the language and decisions of the Church. Had the Bishop contented himself with affirming that our Lord redeemed all mankind; that His Sacrifice was offered for the sins of the whole world; that we know not how far His meritorious Cross and Passion may avail for those who never heard of His Name or of His Sacrifice of Love; that God's Mercy and Love might exceed His own gracious promises; that, being the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, Christ's Redemption looked backward as well as forward, and might have an efficacy beyond what some had been willing to admit;—he would have expressed himself as many within the Church have, without challenge, expressed themselves before him. The Church has not dogmatised in such matters. But the Bishop has done more than this. He has confounded justification with redemption, and it is not the mere mis-application of a word. Justification with him means more than the Church means by redemption. He means what the Church means by justification, but he extends this, which the Church does not, to the whole human race. He says, 'The curse has been utterly taken away, and we all of the human race, being recognised as one with our Head, are counted to be righteous as He is righteous, are made the righteousness of God in Him.'"

After quoting various other like statements, the Metropolitan went on to say:

"The necessary consequence of such views is, that faith in any intelligible and accepted sense cannot be necessary to justi-

fication. And this is the Bishop's view." (Here follow passages in proof.) "But does the Church allow language like this, which, as has been truly said, confounds the Merits of Christ, which are the cause of our justification, with faith, which is the instrument of our justification, the virtue and grace by which it is made ours. Does it allow its teachers to proclaim that all men are justified, let their creed be what it may, or let there be no creed at all? that faith is not needed in order to justification? The Bishop claims justification for men who do not believe in Christ, who have never heard of Him. A heathen remaining a heathen, a Mahometan continuing a Mahometan, is, in his view, justified. . . . Apparently he makes no distinction between a baptized and unbaptized child." . . .

After most anxious consideration, and making every allowance for any counterbalancing passages, the Metropolitan felt obliged to declare the Bishop of Natal's teaching in this matter contradictory to that of the XIth and XVIIIth Articles, the 3rd Collect for Good Friday, the Offices of Holy Baptism (both for Infants and Adults), and the Homilies.

The third charge was that the Bishop maintained all men to have the new birth unto righteousness from their very birth-hour; that is to say, to be regenerated when born into the world as members of the great human family; also that all men are at all times partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ; by which teaching he virtually denied that the two great Sacraments are generally necessary to salvation, and convey any special grace; and further, that faith is the means whereby the Body and Blood of Christ are received and eaten, and that faith is necessary in order that God's Grace, bestowed in Sacraments, may have wholesome effect and operation. Quoting passages which affirm these things,[1] which are not (he remarks) mere incidental passages at variance with the general teaching of the book, the Metropolitan decided that it contradicts the express teaching of the Church Catechism, the Offices for Baptism and Confirmation, the Nicene Creed, and the XXVth, XXVIth,

[1] See Articles of Accusation.

XXVIIth and XXVIIIth Articles, as well as the principle of the Church's teaching in all ages.

The fourth charge concerns eternal punishment, which the Bishop of Natal denied. "I did believe" (he says himself) "in that dogma when I printed those sermons,[1] so far as that can be called belief, which, in fact, was no more than acquiescence. . . . I now declare that I can no longer maintain or give utterance to the doctrine of the endlessness of future punishments," etc. etc. There could be no doubt that such opinions contradict the language of the Church in the Creed of S. Athanasius, the Offices of Burial, and other formularies. The Metropolitan went into a point which had been brought forward on behalf of the Bishop of Natal—viz., that in the Articles of 1552 there was one (the XLIInd) which expressly condemned those who held the opinion that all men should be saved at last; and that this Article was omitted in the revision of 1562. It has been urged that this implied a change of opinion in the revisers, especially Archbishop Parker; but as he about the same time likewise revised the *Reformatio Legum*, according to which such teaching as the Bishop's is heresy, and also put forth a new edition of it in 1571, nine years later, this can hardly be borne out. So of Dean Nowell, his fellow-reviser, and the Lower House of Convocation, of which the Dean was Prolocutor;—his Catechism, with very strong expressions[2] on the subject, having been "unanimously approved and accepted as their own book and owned doctrine." The real reason for this omission is doubtless that assigned by Hardwicke, that the doctrines of the Anabaptists, against which that and some other articles were levelled, were no longer so menacing as they had been a little while before. The Metropolitan remarked that, if this reasoning were to be admitted, it would be equally open to say that the Church had no belief in the Resurrection, an article concerning that essential point of the Faith having been dropped at the same time as the XLIInd.

[1] Village Sermons, 1853.

[2] It speaks of the "*tenebras perpetuas*" of hell; "*ubi scelerum suorum conscientia, et sempiterno igne, atque omni summoque supplicio excruciati, æternas pœnas dabunt atque dependent*" (p. 97, Oxf. Edit. 1835).

The Bishop of Natal had endeavoured to find shelter under the teaching of the Roman Catholics as to Purgatory, but the Metropolitan points out that this is an error. "The teaching of the Church of England clearly is that the punishment of the wicked will last for ever. And this has been the Creed of the Catholic Church in all ages. . . . It is the Creed of the Church of Rome; nor does its doctrine of Purgatory, to which the Bishop refers, and which he pleads as justifying his refusal to believe in the endlessness of punishment, notwithstanding the language of the Creed, really bear him out. His argument is, 'The Church of Rome receives the Creed even as we do, and yet it believes in some remedial process after death. Why may I not interpret the damnatory clauses as the Church of Rome does, and reject the doctrine of everlasting punishment?'

"The reason why is obvious. The Church of Rome holds the doctrine of everlasting punishment, together with that of Purgatory. . . . Purgatory is for the good, not for the wicked; —they are condemned to everlasting punishment."

The remaining charges had reference to the Bishop of Natal's work on the Pentateuch. He was accused of maintaining that, although the Holy Scriptures contain the Word of God, they are not the Word of God, strongly expressed in the sentences, "The Bible is not itself God's Word, but assuredly God's Word will be heard in the Bible."

"The Pentateuch as a whole was not written by Moses; and with respect to some at least of the chief portions of the story, it cannot be regarded as historically true." He also speaks of "the intermixture of human elements, of error, infirmity, passion, and ignorance" in the Old Testament, and says: "For myself, if I cannot find the means of doing away with my present difficulties, I see not how I can retain my Episcopal office, in the discharge of which I must require from others a solemn declaration that they unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament, which, with the evidence now before me, it is impossible for me to believe."

There can be no question as to this (and much more such) language contravening sundry Articles; to wit, the VIth, VIIIth,

XVIIth, XXth, XXIInd, and XXXIVth, as also various parts of the Prayer-book, Nicene Creed, Ordination Office and teaching of the whole Church. "But were the Articles and Formularies altogether silent as to the Bible being the Word of God" (the Metropolitan said), "or were the Church's language less decided on the subject, I should still have felt it my duty to declare on other grounds that the Bishop was not entitled to say that the Bible was not the Word of God, or that it was marked with 'error, infirmity, passion, ignorance.' The Church of England does not date its existence from the period of the Reformation. Its history stretches back to Apostolic times. It holds what the whole Church has always held. Silence upon any particular point of faith, or upon any great question of religion, is no reason for supposing that the Church of England was indifferent to that portion of the Faith. There might be reasons, and there were, why articles and definitions should not be multiplied at the Reformation. But the Articles do not embrace the whole of the Church's teaching. . . . Bishop Pearson says: 'The Book of Articles is not, nor is pretended to be, a complete body of divinity, or a comprehension and explanation of all Christian doctrine necessary to be taught.'" The Metropolitan quoted various other authorities to the same effect, going on to the subject of Inspiration, concerning which Bishop Colenso's false doctrines are copiously cited in the Schedule VI. (see Appendix). Here the question for the Judge to decide was, whether the Church allows her ministers to put forth such statements which reduce a large part of the Old Testament history to a mere legend or fiction?

"Now, without wishing to limit the proper field and province of criticism, or to restrict the freedom which may be regarded as desirable for the eliciting of the truth;—without attempting to define Inspiration—(a word which does not occur in the Articles or Formularies in connection with this subject)—or venturing to say where the human element in the Bible ends and where the Divine begins, I must deny that the Church does or can permit her ministers without restraint to make such assertions as these. They are, in my judgment, wholly

inconsistent with an honest subscription to the Formularies of the Church. It is impossible to conceive that it should be true that the writers of the Bible 'wrote as men, with the same liability to error from any cause as other men;' and yet that the Bible should be 'God's Word written;'—for it is the Bible—not a part of it only, but the whole Bible, that the Church declares to be such. . . . The Church's practice is defended in ordaining that 'nothing be read except the Holy Scriptures,' etc. But according to the Bishop of Natal, the order to read the Pentateuch and other books of the Old Testament in Church, is an order to read fables, myths, uncertain stories and legends. He is at direct issue with the Church as to the character of Holy Scripture. It were a mockery and a wrong for the Church to use the language she does respecting the Scriptures, if in its belief the whole Bible was not the unerring Word of the Living God; or if it were to be ruled that her ministers were allowed to teach that the Sacred Books contain 'uncertain stories and legends,' and openly to reject nine of them as 'legendary' and mythological, full of palpable 'exaggerations, contradictions, impossibilities, and improbabilities,' language must altogether lose its meaning. Pledges, promises, declarations, must be regarded as so much waste paper if the words of the Church in those Formularies and Articles which speak of the Bible, and which are in accordance with, and interpreted by the language of the whole Church on this great subject from the beginning, are not held to be violated by the Bishop in the passages referred to, which are but a specimen of the views propounded throughout his books."

The 7th charge is that of denying the authenticity, genuineness, and truth, of certain books of Holy Scripture, in whole or part—and the passages cited to justify this charge are numerous and long. After quoting some of them, such as that "the account of the Exodus, whatever value it may have, is not historically true,"—that the historical truth of the Pentateuch "is not a doubtful matter of speculation," but that the reverse is "a simple question of facts,"—that it "cannot possibly have been written by Moses, or be regarded as historically true," and

much more to the like purpose;—the Metropolitan went on to say:—

"The charge must be admitted to be proved, but how far does this bring the writer under the condemnation of the Church? And here I would observe that I do throughout these proceedings bear in mind that the inquiry we are conducting is both a very solemn and a very serious one; that it affects the character and future prospects of one high in position; and that the best construction is to be put upon his language which his words will bear. But I must, on the other hand, add that I cannot think that the language of the Church should be strained to the utmost to cover unsound teaching, because the proceedings in which a judge may unhappily be engaged do seriously affect the character and position of an individual. My first duty in this case I believe to be to the Church and to the Church's Lord. I am bound to be on my guard lest consideration for the accused should lead me to say anything which might tend to injure or destroy the Faith, by making that an open question which the Church never intended to be an open question;—or by sanctioning the teaching of error to those who look with confidence to the Church for instruction. The faith and teaching of the Church may be added to, or it may be gradually weakened, undermined, changed, by the decisions of Courts. This last result will arise, if it be declared that the Clergy are not required to teach that which the Church holds to be essential, unless the teaching of it is absolutely enjoined in words which will admit of no doubt or cavil. The Church itself might thus, through no fault of its own,—unless it be a fault not to have expressly provided against every possible heresy,—cease to be a witness for truth which once it upheld. It is the first duty of the Bishops of the Church to see that its teaching shall be preserved pure, incorrupt, complete, fixed, and positive, at all hazards. But so far as is compatible with this, not only must freedom be allowed to the Clergy, but special care must be taken not to overstrain or exaggerate their engagements, and the most generous construction must be put upon the language of any who may be accused of false teaching."

Bearing this in mind, it was impossible not to pronounce Bishop Colenso's teaching as contradicting not only the teaching of the Church, but of our Lord Himself; and this leads on to the 8th charge, of imputing error and ignorance to our Blessed Lord, by affirming that He merely spoke of the Pentateuch "in the language any other devout Jew of that day would have employed," and that His knowledge concerning all such matters was purely human.

The Metropolitan proceeded to show that there was nothing new in these views, which are simply a repetition of the Nestorian heresy. After quoting the General Councils, and several great theologians, he summed up the Bishop of Natal's error "as separating the man from the God, and really following Nestorius."

Defining the true faith, the Metropolitan went on to say:—

"The question raised is not a light one. It is not a mere question of words. If, as the Bishop affirms, our Lord while on earth was ignorant and liable to error,—if He quoted fiction for fact, legends for history,—if He mistook altogether the character of the Bible, believed the mere human composition to be the Word of God,—believed that God really had spoken to Moses when He had not,—made blunders about the most important matters, as to which it has fallen to the lot of Bishop Colenso to set Him right,—then, if these things be so, we have no sure ground for our faith. Mistaken in one point, He Whom we call Lord may have been so in every matter. We could not admit the Bishop's statements without shaking to its very foundation the whole Christian Faith as a revelation from God. I must decide that in imputing to our Blessed Lord ignorance, and the possibility of error, the Bishop has committed himself to a most subtle heresy, destructive of the reality of the Incarnation, and that he has departed from the Catholic Faith, as held in the Church from the beginning, and as expressed in the IInd Article and in the Creeds."

The 9th and last charge, of impugning, depraving, and otherwise bringing into disrepute the Book of Common Prayer,

particularly portions of the Ordinal and Baptismal Services, needed little proof—the Bishop of Natal's writings are sufficiently outspoken. "I see no remedy but to disobey the law of the Church," etc. etc.

Having thus gone through the Articles of Accusation, concerning each one of which no person of ordinary information or judgment can hold any opinion other than that they are fully proved, the Metropolitan concluded in these words:—

"I have felt the greatest difficulty in dealing with this case, and with the charges which have been brought. Considering the office of the accused, the almost entire absence of precedent, the novelty of my own position and that of my brethren who have been my assessors, and the gravity of the charges brought, I would gladly have shrunk, had it been possible, from the responsibility of acting, and have left this most painful case to be dealt with by the Bishops and Doctors of the Mother Church. By general consent, however, it has been concluded that the burden must be laid upon the Metropolitan and Bishops of this Province, all of whom have been summoned as my assessors on this occasion, though some, from the vast distances which separate us, from the great difficulty of communication, and, I may add, the heavy expense to which they would have been put, have, though most anxious to bear their share of responsibility, not been able to be present.

"For myself, I may be permitted to say that I have taken up the burden which has been laid upon me with fear and trembling; but having assumed it, I have felt it to be my duty, looking up to God for guidance, to vindicate, so far as it was in my power to do so, the Church's Faith, and at least rescue it from the charge of conniving at false teaching in the person of one of its Prelates. The accusations brought are many and weighty. They touch the greater number of those doctrines which have been most debated within the Church, and which are unanimously regarded as fundamental. It is with the deepest pain that I have arrived at the conclusion to which I am driven—that my brother, once a witness for the truth, is now a destroyer of that faith which in days past he upheld."

"I do not stand alone in this conviction. It is hardly too much to say that the whole Church concurs in it. On account of these writings which have been under review, nearly [1] every Bishop of the Church of England has called upon him to resign his See, and on his refusal to do this, has inhibited him from officiating in his Diocese. And both Houses of the Provincial Synod and Convocation of Canterbury have pronounced their formal judgment against that work of his which has attracted most attention, but which is hardly more dangerous than the other. They have united in a solemn declaration that the book contains errors of the gravest and most dangerous character, subversive of faith in the Bible as the Word of God. This is a very heavy condemnation. It has, however, further, in my judgment, been most clearly and convincingly proved against the accused, in the proceedings which have taken place before the Bishops of this Province, that not on one point only, but on many, he has contravened and denied the Catholic Faith, as taught and expressed in the Creed, Articles, and Formularies of the Church.

"It becomes, therefore, my painful duty first to declare that, convicted as he has been of false teaching on many grave and fundamental points, involving a wide and systematic departure from the Faith, he is unfit, so long as he shall persist in these errors, to bear rule in the Church of God, or to exercise any sacred offices whatever therein; and next, to pass sentence accordingly. In this opinion, and in the sentence which I am about to give, my assessors entirely agree.

"I have only to add that, if it be desired, as has been intimated, to make a formal appeal to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, I shall consent to forward my judgment to his Grace for revision, waiving in this particular case, which is itself novel and of great importance to the whole Church, any real or supposed rights of this Church, and feeling that it will be a very great relief to submit my decision to the Chief Pastor of the Church at home, and to share my responsibilities with him, and if he should see fit, with the other Bishops of the National Church."

[1] The only dissident was the Bishop of S. David's, Dr. Thirlwall.

Then followed the technical sentence[1] whereby the Bishop of Natal was deposed from that office, and prohibited from the exercise of any divine office within any part of the Metropolitical Province of Cape Town.

Opportunity was given to the accused of retraction by the operation of the sentence being suspended until the 16th of April 1864, at which time, if no such retractation should have been made, the sentence would take effect, and be published in all the churches of the Diocese of Natal, and in the several cathedrals of the Province of Cape Town.

Dr. Bleek handed in Dr. Colenso's protest against the legality of the proceedings, and validity of the judgment, which he announced his intention of treating as a nullity. Dr. Bleek also gave notice that his client intended to appeal from the proceedings, and to resist any attempt to enforce and carry out the execution of the judgment, in such manner and by such lawful ways and process as he should be advised to be proper.

The Metropolitan replied that he could not recognise any appeal save to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and that he must require that to be made within fifteen days from the present time.

Here the proceedings closed. Unfortunately it is too well known to the whole Christian world that the unhappy person in question did not retract his errors, and did proceed to defy the Church without scruple.

[1] See Appendix VII.

CHAPTER IX.

DECEMBER, 1863, TO JULY, 1865.

PASTORAL TO THE CHURCH OF NATAL—CORRESPONDENCE WITH DR. WILLIAMSON, ETC.: WITH MR. KEBLE—LETTERS TO HIS SON ON THEOLOGICAL QUESTIONS—CUDDESDEN, ETC.—LINE OF ACTION CONTEMPLATED BY THE BISHOP—LETTERS FROM MR. KEBLE—FORMAL SENTENCE ON DR. COLENSO PASSED—VISITATION OF NATAL—CHARGE DELIVERED AT THE PRIMARY METROPOLITICAL VISITATION—ADDRESS FROM CLERGY—CONFERENCE—DR. DUFF—DEATH OF MRS. ROBERTSON—DR. COLENSO'S APPEAL HEARD BEFORE THE JUDICIAL COMMITTEE—PUBLIC OPINION THEREON—LETTERS—DEATH OF MR. HENRY GRAY—ORDINATION OF THE BISHOP'S SON—CORRESPONDENCE WITH MR. KEBLE: HIS ILLNESS—JUDGMENT ON DR. COLENSO'S APPEAL—VISITATION CHARGE—ACTS AND RESOLUTIONS OF SYNOD—BISHOP GRAY'S REGRET AT HAVING BEEN REPRESENTED BEFORE THE PRIVY COUNCIL—LETTER TO THE ARCHBISHOP—ADVICE TO HIS SON—JUDGMENT OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL IN DR. COLENSO'S CASE—GENERAL FEELING OF THE CHURCH—DR. PUSEY—THE JUDGMENT RECEIVED IN AFRICA—THE BISHOP'S IMPRESSIONS OF IT—LETTERS TO MR. KEBLE, THE BISHOP OF GRAHAM'S TOWN, ETC.—MEETING OF THE CLERGY OF NATAL—RESOLUTIONS PASSED—UPPER HOUSE OF CONVOCATION—BISHOP OF OXFORD'S SPEECH—ADDRESS OF SYMPATHY AND ADMIRATION FOR BISHOP GRAY PASSED—SENT DOWN TO THE LOWER HOUSE: DISCUSSION THERE—LETTERS TO HIS SON ON A CURATE'S DUTIES.

THE following Pastoral was now read in all the Churches of Natal:—

"TO THE CLERGY AND FAITHFUL LAITY IN NATAL.

"Brethren in Christ—We think it our duty to inform you that, after long and anxious deliberation, we have come to the conclusion that your Bishop has not been charged falsely with erroneous teaching; that he has openly proclaimed opinions which are at variance with the belief of the Church in all ages, and of our own branches of it in particular, and which are, in our judgment, subversive of the Christian Faith. In consequence of this it has been the painful duty of the Metropolitan, with the advice and consent of such other Bishops of the Pro-

vince as could be conveniently assembled, to deprive him of his office as Bishop of Natal, unless he shall within a specified time retract the false teaching which has been condemned. Should he, by God's Grace, be led to see the grievous errors into which he has fallen, and to renounce them, we shall have won back a brother to the Faith, and your Bishop shall be restored to you. Should he refuse to do this, he will no longer have any authority from Christ or his Church to bear rule in the Church of Natal, or in any way to minister in Divine offices; and the Clergy will be released from their vow of canonical obedience to him, and will not be at liberty in any way to recognise him as their Bishop. Let us earnestly pray to God that he may be recovered, and yet again uphold that faith which he once pledged himself to maintain, but which of late he has sought to overthrow. We are not unmindful, brethren, of the sorrows and anxieties and perplexities which have come upon you through the falling away from the Faith of your chief Pastor. It is our desire to bear you continually in remembrance before the Throne of Grace, that not being tossed to and fro by every wind of vain doctrine, you may stand fast in the Faith which is in Christ Jesus, as that Faith has been held and taught by the Church from the beginning, and may walk worthy of the Gospel of Christ. It is possible that your Bishop may return to Natal before receiving the Metropolitan's judgment. If so, you will remember that the sentence does not take effect until the 16th of April next, when the period of retractation will have expired. Commending you very earnestly to the Protection and Guidance of God, we are, dear Brethren, your faithful servants in Christ,

"R. CAPETOWN, Metropolitan.
"H. GRAHAM'S TOWN.
"EDWARD, Bishop, Orange Free State.

"Cape Town, December 17th, 1863."

The Metropolitan's own mind as to the proceedings in Dr. Colenso's trial will be best shown by his private letters written immediately after its conclusion. Sentence was pronounced

December 16th, and on the 18th he wrote as follows to Dr. Williamson:—

"I have not changed my views on the Long judgment. I think it is as unjust to the Church as it is to me, and that is saying a great deal. The Church, indeed, may work under persecution and injustice, and we shall try to do so; but we are sore puzzled. I have had meetings of Bishops and Clergy and laity too during the past month on the subject, and I am still as much at sea, as to action, as ever. We have, however, held a Provincial Synod of Bishops only, and I have been half tempted to send our 'Acts and Constitutions' for the Province, with my compliments, to Lord Kingsdown and his friends. I forward copies to Edward. You will see that we are prepared, if there is to be a struggle with the world, to do what we believe our duty to our Lord requires us to do. If Civil Courts interfere and send Colenso back, God helping, I will excommunicate, and if my brethren will join, will (if the Church at home is afraid to do so) consecrate an orthodox Bishop. I know that this will provoke the vengeance of the civil power; but I am prepared to brave everything in this case. If ever there was a heretic, Colenso is one. If we allow him to act in the name of the Church, the sin is ours, and the punishment will be ours. What would our Lord have us do in this case? What would the early Bishops and martyrs have done? They would have said, 'To whom we gave place by subjection, no not for an hour.'

"I do not mean to defend either my jurisdiction or my judgment in Civil Courts should Colenso appeal to them, though I do not quite see how he is to get there. I have spent one fortune in the Long case, and I have incurred considerable expense in this: I do not feel called to spend my children's inheritance in fighting a battle which I should probably lose, and which would hamper my future proceedings. It is through Civil Courts that the world in these days seeks to crush the Church. They represent the world's feelings, and give judgment accordingly. A great struggle may, and perhaps will, arise out of this case. I don't want to be dogged, but I want to be found faith-

ful, and not by cowardice compromise Christ's Church and truth. I hope that you will help me with prayers and counsel. It will rejoice you to hear that the Bishop of Graham's Town is of one heart and mind with me. We have worked together as brothers; and there is as little difference of opinion between us as there can well be between two men. He has been nearly six weeks in my house, with Bishop Twells. We have spent the whole of every day (nearly) in this case, working separately in our rooms till four P.M., and then comparing our conclusions. We have all three agreed to and revised each other's documents. His mind is a very able analytical mind. You know he was senior wrangler, 1st Smith's prizeman, 1st class classical tripos. He came down certainly not prepared for all that we have agreed upon in Synod, but we have weighed step by step each point, and he concurs in all.[1] This is from the force of truth, not from any influence of mine, for he is mentally far, very far, above me. . . . Our trial lasted five days; Badnall's speech was a very able one, but, I think, not equal to the Dean's. My judgment is long-winded; but I could not help this. It embraces almost the whole circle of theology, and the Bishop not being present,

[1] In his "Statement" relating to the facts of this period, Bishop Gray says:

"The proceedings will, I believe, bear comparison with those ecclesiastical causes conducted before the highest judicial Court in England. The only objections that Dr. Colenso has, I think, himself raised, have related to the presence of the Bishop of the Orange Free State, and to the evidence allowed to be used with reference to the question of Metropolitan jurisdiction. As to the Bishops present, he has said in his letter to the laity of Natal (p. 3): 'The Bishop of Cape Town selected as assistants, two Bishops—one a recent nominee of his own, and nominated, doubtless, as generally agreeing in sentiments with himself; the other, known also beforehand as holding the same opinions as himself very strongly, on the most important matters likely to be discussed.' The facts are that all the Bishops of the Province were summoned; that the Bishops of Graham's Town and of the Free State only could attend; that the Bishop of S. Helena, to whom all the documents connected with the trial were forwarded, wrote to express his concurrence with the sentence. That there was no 'selection,' must, I think, have been known to Dr. Colenso. . . . One assessor, he objects, was 'a recent nominee' of mine. Bishop Twells was a Clergyman holding a cure in the Diocese of London. He had been ordained by the Archbishop. It had been agreed that the Archbishop, the Bishops of London and Oxford, with myself, should appoint. Dr. Twells' name was submitted to all, and assented to by all. But by what law, asks Dr. Colenso, and the Bishop of London has re-echoed the question

I was compelled to quote largely from his works as well as our formularies. I have endeavoured, while condemning him, to say as little as I could about doctrine. I wished not to *make* doctrine, but I wished also not to let heresy be tolerated. Well, God help us all to embrace and to defend the truth. . . . Public opinion and the press here say that we have done the only thing we could in Colenso's case, and that he has had a full and fair trial. May it be the last of my collisions with the world. I wish, if it please God, for the rest of my life to eat my bread in quietness, and do my own work, and have time for the study of God's Word, and the preaching of it, which I have not had these seventeen years."

To the Rev. JOHN KEBLE.

"Bishop's Court, December 17th, 1863.

"My dear Mr. Keble—I have to thank you very sincerely for your generous help towards the payment of the heavy expenses which have fallen upon me. . . . I, yesterday, gave judgment, depriving the Bishop of Natal of his office, allowing

(House of Lords, June 18th, 1866, and Convocation, June 29th), had a Bishop with a Diocese beyond the Queen's dominion a right to sit as assessor in a trial upon a Bishop within the Queen's dominions, holding letters patent? Since the late judgments of the Privy Council, I should have thought the question would not have been asked. The Long Judgment declared that Colonial Churches were in law only voluntary bodies. The Natal Judgment declared that there is no Diocese, no jurisdiction, no territorial limits—nothing but a title and a lay corporation. But, apart from this, the Bishop of the Free State was appointed precisely in the same manner as the Bishop of Natal, or any other Colonial Bishop, with this only difference, that the one appointment was by letters missive or mandatory, the others by letters patent. . . . In law, one Bishop's position is as good as another's. Neither has legal rights to sit in judgment upon the other. By the law of the Church, by canon law accepted by the Church of England, Dr. Twells was as much a Bishop of this Province as Dr. Colenso. The objections against the other Bishop are equally futile. 'He was known beforehand as holding the same opinions as myself very strongly,' etc. I had thought otherwise. The Bishop of Graham's Town had been declared often to be a very pronounced Evangelical; I an equally decided High Churchman. The 'most important matters to be discussed,' were the doctrines of Justification, the Atonement, the Sacraments, the Nature of our Lord, the Inspiration of the written Word, the authority of the Church—questions upon which our supposed different schools of opinion might be expected not altogether to agree."—P. 38.

him till the 16th April 1864 to retract absolutely and unconditionally the passages from his writings articled against him. . . . The case was very ably argued. . . . The Dean's speech was really a very remarkable production. . . . Colenso will, of course, endeavour to get the case before a civil court, and I am writing to say that I will neither defend my jurisdiction nor my sentence before a civil court. Poverty alone would prevent my rushing into heavy expenses, but I make my stand on principle. These courts are no courts of appeal for us. However, on this and on other points I forward to you a report of our proceedings in a Provincial Synod which we have just held. You will, I trust, approve of all that we have determined upon, saving our resolution about laity. I do not think, however, that in the position in which we place them, and keeping the Diocesan Synod in its due subordination to the Provincial, we need anticipate evil from their presence. I have never found any, and, though keenly alive to the mischief arising in some Dioceses, do not apprehend any here. I think it doubtful, however, whether I shall myself invite them again, after the language of the Long judgment on this subject, which I regard as offensive and impertinent. I probably shall throw the responsibility very much on the laity themselves. If they are very anxious to come, I must invite them; if they prove indifferent, they will forfeit the privilege.

"I am myself prepared, should a civil court thrust Colenso back, not only to cut him off from the Church, but to consecrate another Bishop if the Church at home and the Colonial Secretary decline to send out another. Will you tell me what you think our duty would be?

"I have given the judgment which I have done with trembling. The charges touch nearly all the greatest questions of the Christian faith. I hope that I have not *made* doctrine, and I hope that I have said nothing to sanction heresy. We have had a difficult duty to discharge. It is one which might have troubled even you. We have done our best, and spared no labour. May our Lord accept what we have done for the vindication of His Name and Truth. Pray for us that we may be

faithful whatever comes upon us, and act wisely and humbly. There *was* a serious difference between the Bishops and the lawyers in the Essay case. I pray God the Bishops have not yielded. I confess I look with the utmost alarm upon this assumption of civil courts in matters of faith. *We* protested, and forwarded our protest in 1850, after the Gorham judgment, to the late Archbishop, saying we could not receive the decisions of the Privy Council in matters of faith as binding upon us. But I will not weary you further. It is a great comfort to hear that dear Mrs. Keble is restored to you again. My wife is, as usual, working hard for me. . . . If the writer of the article in the *Edinburgh* will pay me a visit I will show him that I have some work to do, and give him some too if he is inclined for it."

To Charles Norris Gray, Esq.

"Bishop's Court, December 19th, 1863.

"My dearest boy—By this mail you will receive my judgment deposing the Bishop of Natal. It is of necessity very long. . . . I do not mean to defend either my jurisdiction or my sentence before a civil court, if he should succeed in getting his case before one. But I have forwarded the whole proceedings to the Archbishop of Canterbury for his consideration. We have also held a Provincial Synod, and resolved that if Dr. Colenso should resume Episcopal functions without retractation, or restoration by the Metropolitan, it will be my duty to pass the formal sentence of excommunication. . . . I do not feel called on to maintain my cause before judges whose authority to decide it I do not recognise, and the Church has left me to fight this battle alone. Dear Mr. Keble is the only one that has as yet helped me. We are clear and decided here as to the future. If a struggle comes with the civil power and civil courts, we are, I trust, prepared for it."

And a little later (March 19th, 1864) the Bishop wrote to Mrs. Mowbray: "If you see Sir John Coleridge again you may tell him from me that he has wronged by his judgment all those young Churches which in our Colonies are struggling to

plant the faith of Christ. He has sought to bring them under the power of the world, and into the same miserable bondage as that under which the Church of England groans, and from which she must free herself or perish. With us it will fail, and it may be that this Colenso case will bring the question as to whether the Colonial Churches are to bow down before the world and the Dagon of the Privy Council to an open issue. For myself, I say that I will not go before any civil court in the matter, and that I will not be restrained by any sentences they may give from doing my duty to my Lord. If they send us back Colenso, I will excommunicate him. If my brother Bishops and the Diocese of Natal will unite with me, and I can find the right man, I will consecrate a successor in the face of the State and its heretical Bishop. I am much disturbed at hearing that an appeal is about to be made for funds to carry on legal proceedings in England. I must protest against being supposed to concur in this. From the first I have said I would be no party to legal proceedings. It cannot possibly help me. My costs and difficulties are outside English courts this time. Were I to spend another fortune in vindicating the discipline of the Church, I know what English lawyers' hatred of ecclesiastical courts and ecclesiastical authority would lead the Privy Council to decide. I could write their judgment for them. Perhaps, dear, you will think this bitter. It may be so, but the Church may well be bitter under her wrongs from the world and the courts of law, in whose decisions all those wrongs are concentrated. If the Church does not denounce the judgment which I hear is to be delivered *in re Essays and Reviews*, she will cease to witness for Christ. She must destroy that masterpiece of Satan for the overthrow of the Faith—the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council as her Court of Final Appeal—or it will destroy her. Now, where shall we find a Bishop for the See of Natal in England, who, trusting to God only for his support, will consent to be pastor of a poor and distracted flock, that knows not what to believe, or where to look for counsel? I am sure there are many such. There are some here that would be willing to go, but they

think with me that we want a fresh man from England. I ask the Archbishop and S. Oxon to look out for a man, and if the law restrains the Archbishop, beg him at least to encourage us to do our duty. The assumption of the Crown as to the right of appointments and the necessity of letters patent I hold to be mere assumptions; but if not, no earthly law or claim can hold good against the law of Christ. And so, not intending it, I have poured out my mind to you on a subject much in my thoughts. You used to like stories of the early Church when you were a good little girl:—How would a primitive Bishop have acted if the powers of the world had set aside his spiritual sentence, and bade him welcome back a heretic? God give us grace to do as they would have done."

Full as the Bishop's thoughts were, as he says, of this momentous subject, he was not thereby rendered indifferent to general interests, above all when they concerned others. In the letter of December 19th to his son, already quoted, after dwelling upon the uppermost topic, he goes on to say: "I am glad that you are attending theological lectures. You have nearly everything yet to learn on the subject of theology. Tell your young heretic, as you call him, to pray and live near to God, and study, and be humble. He will never reach the truth if he does not adopt this course. Forwardness and bumptiousness betoken a temper of mind which will lead to a fall. You will see what Burgon says about Jael at p. 222 in his volume on Inspiration. In judging of such acts, we must bear in mind that the Bible professes to be the record of a history of perpetual revelations of God's Will. It is very concise, leaves gaps to be filled up, touches generally only salient points. Jael's deed done by you or me would be a treacherous and a wicked act. But God may see fit to cut off an oppressor—be he a Napoleon or Robespierre—by disease, or the hand of an avenger. Cholera, or fever, or war, or an assassin, may be the instrument that God chooses to use to rid the world of one who is an enemy both of God and man. The only question is, whether God has ordered it. He often does smite with sick-

ness, as He did Herod, who was eaten up with worms. He *may* have smitten by Jael's hand;—the Scripture implies that He did. If Jael was moved by Him to cut off the oppressor in this particular way, the act could not be wrong. The whole question turns upon whether she did act in accordance with the Divine Will? If your 'young heretic' does not believe that the Bible relates facts truly, he should leave it alone altogether. He should take its whole statements or none. It is consistent with itself and with the character of God, if looked at from its own point of view as a supernatural history. But if you leave out the supernatural, and refuse to believe it, you should in fairness let its statements alone. We have been very hard at work these six weeks. The Bishop of Graham's Town has left. Bishop Twells leaves in a few days. People here seem to think we have taken the only course open to us, and say that Bishop Colenso has had a fair trial. We have bad news from the Zambesi. Rowley has been for some days in my house. The Bishop has come down to near the mouth of the Shire, and settled upon a mountain. I begin to fear that the Mission will not be able to hold its ground. I am anxious to hear the result of your examination.—Ever, my dearest boy, your affectionate Father, R. CAPETOWN."

To the Same.

"Kalk Bay, January 18th, 1864.

"My dearest boy—I am glad that you have got your testamur. A little steady work from the beginning would have got you more. You have, however, had the full benefit of all Oxford can give for four years, and have, I trust, laid the foundations upon which you may build in after-life. You say that you are more fond of reading. I hope that you will now keep close to theology for the year at Cuddesden, to which I am glad you are going, and where you will, I think, find a really good man in Mr. King. . . . You must remember that you have got to lay the foundations of the greatest of all sciences, for you have never yet *studied* theology. Hooker is, I think, the book that will most deeply interest you. It is the work of a great

master. You must tell me what the course of study is. You kick in your mind against what you call private school rules; but there is wisdom in these rules. They would scarcely be felt if they were not needed. Comfort yourself with the thought of this. I am sorry that you undertook a walk of eighty miles in twenty-four hours. It is too great a strain upon the system, and is very different from ordinary athletic exercises. I hope you will not be the worse for it; but I think you will fail."

"February 19th, 1864.

"I am very thankful to think that you are now at a Theological College, and I trust that your year may be greatly blessed to you—that you will lay the foundations of theological learning, and enter with humility and earnestness upon the greatest questions which can exercise the soul and mind of man. I envy you the year of quiet thought and study under able guidance. You fear that you will find it slow. I do not, if you will enter upon the real work of the place. Your mind will open out to new questions and studies, and you will have laid a foundation upon which, in after-life, you may build. There will be two parties, I doubt not, there as elsewhere—an idle and a studious one. Keep clear of the former. I wish that I could look in upon you. . . . We are all very quiet here, preparing for the struggle which we may have yet to go through; for we do not mean to let Civil Courts ride rough-shod over us. I think I told you that the Zambesi Mission is breaking up. We may have Bishop Tozer and his party down here any day in the 'Pioneer.' I trust that they will immediately recommence operations in Panda's country, and the regions beyond to the north-east of Natal, which is the nearest approach to the plan originally intended which is feasible. The N.E. of Panda's country is only 700 miles from the Zambesi."

"March 17th, 1864.

"It is a great comfort to hear that you have settled into your new position well, and without any great distaste for it. Restraint at your age, and with your habits and disposition, is

sure to be distasteful. If you have your doubts or dislikes as to anything, talk the matter over privately with the Principal, instead of either brooding over it or denouncing it. He may show you reasons for things which do not occur to you. Your tendency to set down things or persons as absurd should be watched and checked. I am very glad that you like Mr. King so much. Everybody speaks most highly of him. Though your year be somewhat irksome to your temperament, I am mistaken if in after years you will not look back upon it with thankfulness. But I don't want to preach.

"I consider myself as just entering upon the real struggle in the matter of Colenso. I have very strong convictions as to what duty may call me to in his case. And I do not feel sure that others will concur altogether in my views. I hope that I may be led to do neither more nor less than what God would have me do. Very possibly I may go to Natal after the next mail comes in; but this is uncertain."

"Pieter Maritzburg, May 27th, 1864.

"My dearest boy—I am sorry that the great pressure of anxious work now upon me prevents my writing as fully to you as I could wish to do at this time. You are much in my thoughts, because I feel that your present year is probably the most important in your life,—that during it your views will be deepened, and your whole future career become one of real devotion to God, and zeal for His Service, or else that your ministry will become shallow, commonplace, lifeless. My prayers are offered for you day and night that you may be filled with God's Holy Spirit, and led to give yourself up wholly to Him and to His Service. I shall be very glad to hear that you have got into free and friendly intercourse with Mr. King. We have had a laborious and anxious month here. People are very ignorant on religious subjects, and much in love with Privy Councils, and jealous of Church authority, and publish in the papers that I wish to become Pope of South Africa! But God overrules all. We have had a very interesting Visitation, during which I delivered a very long charge, which has made some impres-

sion, and which I hope to send to you with a sermon which I have been asked to publish, by this mail. And we have had an important conference. . . . The Clergy say in their address, that if a Civil Court were to send Colenso back, they dare not recognise him as having spiritual authority; and the whole Conference say that they can never again receive him as their Bishop."

There is something very remarkable in finding the Bishop, with all his energy and life, all his sensitiveness for the Faith, and anxiety to exercise the fullest consideration and tenderness for others, so perfectly calm and undoubting after the harassing time of Dr. Colenso's trial and all the troubles appertaining to it. He writes soon after its conclusion to his brother:—

"Kalk Bay, January 14th, 1864.

. . . . "I have seldom had greater quiet of mind than now. Thank God, I can go about my work at present without great anxiety. I often think that at such seasons one is gathering strength for some greater future trial, under which, but for previous rest, one would break down. Colenso will, I fear, give me much trouble; but I am thankful that I have no doubt about his case, and only trust that I may have grace given to act wisely and firmly under whatever circumstances may arise.

. . . . "Colenso's name does not appear in our papers. They are usually self-sufficient enough, but I do not see in any of them a single letter criticising my judgment in any way. There seems a certain awe over men's minds. The case is too bad to be taken up and defended. . . . We are down here for a change, but I get less quiet than at home, and the glare distresses me. There is a good deal to be done among the coloured people, which I cannot half do. I have a class of about sixteen for Baptism or Confirmation. I get a bathe most mornings and short swim, but the bathing is bad, the coast rocky, and the sea heavy. This, with catechisings, visits (for the place is full), sermon-writing, and a ride generally with Sophy, fills up the day."

"Bishop's Court, February 18th, 1864.

"My dear Edward—I am thankful that the Treasury is willing to bear part of the expenses to which I have been put;[1] but they should have borne all or none: I cannot understand their principle. Seeing that nothing was done, the Clergy here have been moving in the matter. I shall now stop them. The utter prostration of this country, amounting almost to a general bankruptcy, is sufficient reason for laying no needless burden on any one. . . . The line of the press and of Churchmen sickens me. The Privy Council is the great Dagon of the English Church—all fall down before it. If it sends back Colenso, I shall still excommunicate, and then it will turn and rend me. I write by this mail to the Archbishop, and pray him, if Civil Courts reinstate Colenso, and prevent him from consecrating a successor, to write and encourage me to do my duty to our Lord and to the Church, for which He gave Himself, and to elect out here and consecrate one, without letters patent or other idle formalities. I do not look forward to all this with any satisfaction, but, I trust, with a mind made up; and nothing so disheartens one and weakens one's hands, as this miserable subservience in matters of faith to the world and the Courts of the world. . . . I have had very nice letters from the Archbishop and others.[2]

"Bishop's Court, March 18th, 1864.

"My dear Edward—I am sorry that an old gentleman of your years should have so much trouble about my affairs, especially when your better half, having no employment, was sure to be niggling at you from morning till night. (It is well that I am at this distance, or I know what sort of a punching I

[1] In the Long case.

[2] Among the many letters of this period the Bishop was pleased with one from Dr. Alexander Duff, a well-known Free Kirk Missionary from India, who was at that time travelling in Africa. "Since my arrival," he says, "I have been perusing, with painful yet joyous interest, the trial of the Bishop of Natal for erroneous teaching: painful because of the erroneous teaching, joyous because of the noble stand made by your Lordship and the Clergy at large for true, primitive, apostolic teaching. For this stand, worthy even of primitive times, it is no mere word of course to say that I do, unfeignedly, thank God and take courage."

should get!) However, we may all thank God that the poor dear soul is now herself again. . . . The real expense to me in this case will be in the future steps I may have to take, and risks to run, in bringing out another Bishop. The funds given in answer to the contemplated appeal, will, I believe, mainly go to enable the Colonial Bishops' Council to fight a battle in the Civil Court. Of course this is quite legitimate, but I hope it will not be done under the idea of helping me. I should be far more effectually helped by any single person, great or small, advertising in the *Guardian* that he would receive any contributions that might be offered to relieve me of some portion of the cost to which I had been put, and still expected to be put, in vindicating the discipline and faith of the Church. I object to be mixed up with any appeal for funds to fight a battle in Colenso's case in the Civil Courts, which from the beginning I said that I would not fight. My line is a purely spiritual one. I will consecrate a successor, let the world say and do what it will. I know that I may get into great difficulties through such a course; that the world will turn and rend me; but stop short I dare not, when the question is whether the Church is to witness for Christ, or to allow one convicted of most grievous heresies to usurp government over the flock of Christ. I will do, God helping me and the Church concurring, what I believe S. Cyprian would have done, under my circumstances, in N. Africa in the third century. Our relations to the world and to the Empire are the same. Now, do not fuss and trouble yourself about all this. I don't want you to do anything, but I write freely to you, because I think you would wish to know what view I take as to the proposed Appeal. All that I would ask of you would be, that if I am in any way compromised by this Appeal, you would write a line to the *Guardian* to say that I am not in any way a party to it. I do not, however, wish this to be done, unless I am clearly compromised. . . . The Bishop of Oxford has told me what the P. C. Judgment, *in re* Essays, etc., would be. I pray God that the Archbishop may not only dissent, but tell the Council that he protests against the judgment as in any way

a judgment of the Church; and that he may call upon the Clergy and faithful Laity to join in his protest. If the Church of England submits to having heretics ministering at her altars, she ceases to witness for Christ, and her candlestick will be removed."

Among the letters which at this critical period cheered up the Bishop's heart, was one from Mr. Keble, dated—

"Torquay, February 29th, 1864.

"My dear Lord—I do not know how to feel ashamed enough for not having sooner written. I quite meant to do so last month, but stupidly missed the time. And I am sure we none of us know how to thank you and your assessors, and I will add your Dean and the other prosecutors, enough for all that you have done in that momentous trial, both matter and manner. But you would not like for me to go on and say what I should like to say about that. God grant that your health may be spared, and that you may be duly supported here; and I hope that there is a fairer chance of it than the seeming apathy hitherto would make one think. Pusey's opinion, written to me on the announcement of the sentence, ran thus:—

"'The Bishop of Cape Town, I hope, is quite clear and healthful. I see that he does not allow any appeal except to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and I hope that even if made the Archbishop would not accept it, for it would bring in first his own lay representative, Dr. Lushington, and secondly the appeal to that infidel Privy Council. Then I understand that he means to fill up the See of Natal. I hope that he will do this in Natal itself, in presence of the people, so that they might virtually accept the new Bishop. This would embarrass the Privy Council exceedingly. This, I hope, he will do as soon as the time is expired which he has allowed. This was the way in the great case of Basilides and Martialis, which S. Cyprian approved without waiting for any appeal.'

"Thus far E. B. P. As I write it out I feel how wrong it was in me to let slip the last mail, for I suppose the time is

long past for you to have acted literally on his suggestion. It seems quite understood that Dr. Colenso declines the Archbishop's jurisdiction as much as yours. I have seen talk of a petition to the Queen, which means, I suppose, to the Privy Council, and such papers as the *Guardian* write in their oracular way of the doubtfulness of the law on the subject. On the other hand, I am told that the *Times* (?) and the general impression is in your favour in this instance. But I should fear it only means that if there were an appeal to the Privy Council the case is so flagrant that you would get your cause. Whether you would be supported in declining the jurisdiction is another question. I have good hope that you might, especially considering the terrible exposure which the Court has just made of itself, which is rapidly leading, as you will hear by this mail, to a coalition between High and Low Church to dethrone it. Under such circumstances, and speaking with such very limited information as I can have, I could wish that it might be found possible to mitigate instead of defying the Queen's Supremacy, and while you decline to plead on the question of deprival, obtain a real Church check upon the appointment of a successor; still keeping (as it were by way of a rod in your pocket) the resolution to renounce the Supremacy if it be so intolerably abused. Would it not be well to get from Natal itself a move, as nearly unanimous as possible, for petitioning yourself (and through you the Crown) to fill up the vacancy as soon as possible, or rather to allow the African Church itself to do so? It might be so worded as to pledge them before God and man never to accept Colenso back again; and if you could get it amply supported from the other Dioceses of your Province, it *must* be attended to. We on our side *must*, and I doubt not *shall*, adopt it as our own cause, and make the Government understand that it will be a *casus belli* for them to pretend to reverse such a sentence as yours. The judicial tone and fairness which even the enemy allows to have been kept up in Colenso's trial will greatly help us.

"In one thing I own I am less sanguine than I was. Our dear good Archbishop will hardly, I fear, prove equal to such a

crisis. He somehow has allowed the lawyers to mystify him in this Wilson case, and is even now before the world as tolerating their sophistry about the word *αἰώνιος*, which it seems to me that any clear-headed boy might refute. He has promised to explain himself, and do away with the scandal; but I cannot hear that he has done anything yet. . . . I have asked my neighbour, Sir William Heathcote, to consider about bringing in a Bill for a better Court of Appeal, and I think he is turning his mind that way. But after all, referring matters to the Bishops, with whatever help, would hardly set us right, unless we could mend the *Bishop-makers: there* eventually will be the tug of war. I wonder whether, if the Privy Council meddled, a prohibition might be moved for in any of the Courts. That would be one way of testing the law; or Colenso might bring a civil action against the trustees denying him his salary;—that would be another. Anyhow, if we were prepared in our several provinces with passive resistance;—South Africa to refuse Colenso, England to ignore and disobey sentences which are against the Faith, we should keep our deposit, and that is the one thing needful. I trust we shall have grace to do so."

"March 1st.

"Since I wrote the above I have heard that a plan is on foot for a 'monster' petition to the Queen against the Court of Appeal, presented by the Bishop of Oxford, who is also understood to approve of a 'Declaration'[1] emanating from Christ Church and Record, pledging all the Clergy who sign it to the doctrines of Plenary Inspiration and Eternal Judgment in a way that cannot, I think, be evaded. I have not a copy to send you, but doubtless it will reach you by this mail. It is a most providential thing that E. B. P. keeps so well, and so thoroughly up to work. His Conference, in which he gathers from seventy to eighty undergraduates and B.A.'s, and permits them to produce their Scripture difficulties, which he discourses on, are said to be doing great good; and Liddon is like a second edition of himself (though indeed he is a most original and

[1] See *Guardian* of March 9th, 1864.

first-rate man), raised up to help and comfort him. What surprises me much is the pecuniary apathy of our friends in the Williams and Wilson causes, as well as in Colenso's. I want to make a noise about it, but hardly know how, having been obliged to part company with the *Guardian* by their way of dealing with the doctrine of Judgment. . . . You see, my dear Lord, how I am fain to fill up my paper with scraps of matter which will be of no use, when I could wish to be sending you hints and precedents from antiquity, or the like. I am away even from my own books, having been driven here just after Christmas by symptoms on my wife's chest which left us no choice, and we chose this place instead of Penzance as being far less of a journey."

"March 4th.

"I have, I am sorry to say, no more news at present. The good Primate has not as yet, that I can find, put out any declaration of his dissent from the offensive judgment. It must be hoped that, when it does come, it will be the more full and absolute and entire, and backed by his brethren. Stanley, who appears more prominent than any one else in the Latitudinarian move, is going on in a wonderfully dexterous way, trying how far he can get every one to symbolise with him. He is now (this is private *at present*) getting up a group of preachers for the Abbey after Easter, and he has asked Pusey, who rather demurred, but now finds that the Archbishop of York, Canon Stowell, and others, have accepted. What should *you* do? But of course this is an abstract question. Yet I should like to know. Canon Wordsworth, G. Williams, and others, say Yes. One most shocking thing is the number of persons who subscribe (it seems) to Colenso's Fund. I trust that we too shall find help. But you don't like that subject. Now I have only just room to say for my wife and myself how much and earnestly we remember you and Mrs. Gray. May God reward you.—Most truly yours, J. K."

The Bishop's answer to this letter was as follows:—

"Bishop's Court, April 12th, 1864.

"My dear Mr. Keble—I have to-day received your kind letter of the 29th. It has been a great comfort and refreshment, amid much to depress me. We received that awful judgment of the P. C., *in re* Williams and Wilson, by a stray Indian steamer. By another stray steamer I wrote to the dear Archbishop in deep distress, entreating him to call upon the Church to repudiate it. It seems to me that that judgment commits the Church if she does not repudiate it—I. To heresy in the matter of eternal punishment; II. To the loss of all real Revelation, for it will cover all that Dr. Colenso has written; III. To an admission that she is not a branch of the Catholic Church by refusing to consider anything but the documents of the Reformation as expressing her Creed;—the decision of General Councils, for instance, *in re* Nestorius, appear to be no part of her Faith.

"I have told the Archbishop that, if not repudiated by the Church, I fear it will break up our Communion; for that, determined as we are to stand by the Faith, I do not see how we can continue to call ourselves 'in union and full communion' with a Church that tamely surrenders it. A really bold line alone will save the Church at this crisis. She must formally in her Synods repudiate the profane judgment, and deny that that Court is sanctioned by her, or entitled to misrepresent the Faith in her name. The world cannot crush the Church if she will assert her independence, and at all hazards witness for Christ. Her servility is her great curse, and will, if she does not rise up in the strength of her God, prove her ruin. I have sent my letter through the Bishop of Oxford, fearing it might be too strong, and I have entreated him, if the Archbishops fail at this crisis, to put himself at the head of a great movement. I feel ashamed to be writing all this to *you*, but the trial to which I am just now exposed makes me feel strongly, and perhaps speak too freely. Many thanks for your and dear Dr. Pusey's counsel. I have just heard from him. The mail sails for Natal on the evening of the 16th—next Saturday. I have taken a passage in it for myself and my wife. On that day

the time allowed to the Bishop for recalling his writings expires, and I go up to take charge of the Diocese *sede vacante*, and to hold my metropolitical Visitation. The Diocese, as might be expected, is in a very sad state. The Dean of Maritzburg, a very devoted man, is the only person in the whole country with whom I can take free counsel. . . . I could not consecrate a Bishop at once, even if I could get the Clergy to elect, or the Laity to concur, for we have not a man ready. All the Presenters would do, but it would not perhaps be well to appoint them, and all have large families, and there may be absolutely no maintenance. . . . I trust that you will pray for me, that I may be guided aright."

Mr. Keble wrote again :—

"Penzance, Low Sunday, 1864.

"My dear Lord—I must write a few lines by this mail, though I have nothing to say, or next to nothing, but what you will see in the papers. Our water at home is so hot, that as yet we hardly feel the stream from South Africa; which yet, I suppose, we must. Not a word have I yet heard of Colenso's appealing, more than when I wrote last; only I see that some keep on subscribing to his fund: in the last batch is Mr. Jowett's name, which, of course, is as it should be. I fancy by the little I can hear, that our lawyers and statesmen find the late judgment a more serious matter than they had expected, and that some of the best are by this time seriously turning their minds towards amending the Court of Appeal. The Archbishop's Pastoral [1] (is it not excellent?) has made them open their eyes. Heathcote and Page Wood, among others, are laying their heads together; and I fancy there is some notion of asking the Chancellor in the House of Lords why the Bishops might not explain in Court the reasons of their dissent from the other Judges, which simple question will open the whole matter. I have reason to believe that ——, notwithstanding appearances, is really thinking very deeply on the subject. I will give you (in religious confidence) a couple of sentences from a letter I have just received from him.

[1] See *Guardian* of March 23rd, 1864; and for the Archbishop of York's Pastoral, May 11th, 1864.

"'I am sorry to say, the more I have thought of the matter, the worse it seems. I am impressed with the fear that in matters of faith, what is called judicial construction will be found to mean liberty of simple contradiction to solemn engagements; and also that the chain of reasoning, which seems only to question one point as an isolated point of religion, in reality involves the whole fabric of Christian belief.' This and some other things being as they are, I think that, at any rate, things will not be allowed to pass away as in a dream. The sort of coalition between us and the Low Churchmen is likely, I trust, to do much good, though, for the present, it estranges us from some who had been learning for years to decline touching the *Record* except with a pair of tongs to put it into the fire! The squabble about Jowett's salary, too, has made a kind of breach for the time between E. B. P. and many Conservatives. But the Primate with his 10,000 will, on the whole, *D.V.*, keep us well together. The tendency of the Court will, I fear, prove one of the most untoward things. A friend of mine, the other day, was looking at a certain devotional book, the title of which I do not know, but it is from the German, and is understood to have been the Prince Consort's favourite manual, and to be under Her Majesty's especial patronage. In it my friend saw clearly taught the non-existence of the Evil Spirit, and the passages concerning him in the Gospels made out to be mere accommodations to Jewish prejudices! I am not surprised at this, seeing the great favour shown to ——, whose theology looks worse and worse the more one knows of it. . . . I trust that we shall hear that you are holding your own, and in good heart. —I am, my dear Lord, ever yours, JOHN KEBLE."

It is perhaps better here to carry on this correspondence, so interesting as it is, to completeness, and to give the Bishop's reply:—

"Deanery, Maritzburg, May 30th, 1864.

"My dear Mr. Keble—Your letter, dated Low Sunday, reached me here yesterday. I must strive to find a few moments to thank you, though the mail leaves on Wednesday, and I have much to do and write.

"I have had an anxious and most laborious month here; but by God's Goodness all has been done that I think could have been done. The Clergy, in their address to me, say that if Dr. Colenso were to come out again with legal authority, they dare not receive him as having spiritual authority; and the Conference of Clergy and Laity say that under no circumstances could they ever again receive him as their Bishop. Declarations too are about, repudiating his opinions. . . . The great difficulty with which I have had to contend has been the ingrained notions of an exaggerated supremacy, and the notions about 'free inquiry,' and 'persecution,' and, perhaps, a little jealousy of a Bishop from the old Colony. Upon the whole, however, I have been most heartily received by Clergy and Laity and I think they feel grateful for my making sacrifices to come and stand up for our Lord and His Truth among them. The Cathedral has been crowded, and I have been preaching unceasingly. Nothing can well be worse than the state of the Diocese. I hope, however, to ordain two good men, but we want ten for immediate service. I am told that Colenso means to bring out men of his views, and funds too, and create a work. If the Church does not fill up posts from which there is a cry for help, they will, I fear, accept Colenso's men, rather than have none; for people here are very ignorant as to his views, and the lengths to which he has gone."

Upon Mr. Keble's next letter, the Bishop of Cape Town has made a note to the effect that it was written under a misapprehension. "I had expressed,[1] both to him and to the Bishop of Oxford, my conviction that if the Church of England did not repudiate Dr. Colenso, she would be in alliance with heresy, and drive those of her members, who felt it to be their first duty to maintain the Faith, out of her communion."

"Hursley, June 4th, 1864.

"My dear Lord and my dear friend—I fear my letter will be even more hurried and unsatisfactory than usual, for here is

[1] See letter above of April 12th, 1864.

almost the hour come for posting it, and I have let the days slip almost unawares since I received yours. I have wished I had accepted an offer which the Bishop of Oxford made me at Cuddesden the other day, to read your letters before I left him as I did rather in a hurry. I had not realised the greatness of the subject of them, though he gave me some idea. But since I have heard from yourself there was the less need.

"I am afraid that, pressed as I am for time, I shall speak in too off-hand a way; but you will understand me. I will say then at once that your letter gives me the idea (and I am afraid that S. Oxon, etc., will have the same) of our hastening *too eagerly* to the 'ultima ratio,' which in this case would surely be the greatest calamity to the whole Church. That 'ultima ratio' must surely be kept in mind, and influential people, like those you have written to, must be made aware that it is so. But I have observed, even on this very subject, that the best persons I know, whenever I give a hint tending that way, seem to recoil from the idea; it strikes them as 'deserting one's post.' I gather from this that we ought to wait until the complicity of the Church of England in these atrocities is much more decided than it is yet before we set up 'altar against altar.' And I don't really feel that it is 'servility.' I have no doubt that in such a man as, *e.g.*, ——, who cannot bear the idea, it arises from nothing but pastoral and dutiful feelings. He says to himself, 'Because some who ought to know better allow wolves to come in in sheep's clothing, is that a reason for me to leave the flock, and not rather to stay that I may protect it?' I grant that in your case there is a difference. You can in a manner take your flock with you out of the way. An English Bishop, for obvious reasons, could not half so well do the same; and a Priest, or any number of Priests, without a Bishop, separating from the body simply on account of the present scandal, would be just giving up self, flock, and all, in a kind of suicide, which would please only the enemy. But I conceive that you do not mean anything so strong at present; it could only be when the hope of adequate repudiation was gone. Now really, unless I greatly flatter my-

self, we are in a way to something like it. First we have the two Archbishops and the nearly 12,000 Clergy who have publicly disallowed and branded these heresies. Then there will be a great demonstration of all sorts, Clergy and Laity, rich and poor, Whigs and Tories, etc., waiting to thank the Archbishops for so doing. At least the train for such a thing is laid, and we have good hope that the explosion will be very loud. Then there will, I quite expect, be a synodical condemnation of *Essays and Reviews.* And what seems to me most important of all, the Archbishop will, I believe, ask the House of Lords for a select Committee to take into consideration the state of the law as to dealing in the last resort with Ecclesiastical causes involving doctrine. It may be granted, and it would be too barefaced to deny it. I cannot conceive their making any other report than such as would incurably damage the present Court; and *that* being once put down as unconstitutional, these dreadful decrees would of course go with it, as those of the Star Chamber and High Commission Courts did. And then we should be formally right again, should we not? At least if we could get, as we surely might, a Court which should be bound to give due weight to real Church authority. All this would take time, and might take more than one session, perhaps more than one Parliament; but if it showed life as it went on, and ended well at last, how sorry would a good Churchman be to have excluded himself from such a move by premature separation; and would he not have to reflect that if many had followed his example, perhaps the contrary result might have followed, there would not have been enough to fight the battle? 'Hoc Ithacus velit.' I fear that if South Africa were to put us out of communion, we being no more committed to these heresies than we are at present, it would greatly add to our difficulty in shaking them entirely off, and would also, from the severe view which it would imply of our position, drive not a few in the direction of Rome.

"Of course there are limits to the forbearance which I recommend. As soon as it became quite plain that the English nation had finally made up its mind to carry on this kind of

tyranny with a high hand, the sin of the Church in bearing with it would *perhaps* be rightly considered intolerable, and the Bishops going on to connive at it would *perhaps* have forfeited their claim to be communicated with; and then *perhaps* it would be right and canonical for the other Bishops of the Reformed Catholic Church to come to the relief of the orthodox in England, and supply them with the means of grace, excommunicating those who would then be the State Bishops. I don't see my way in the matter *canonically;* but *if* such a miserable necessity should arise, His tokens would not be wanting to His people. I feel absolutely certain that it has not yet arisen; that what has happened is indeed most dangerous to the *well*-being of our Church, but has not affected her being; that to whatever extent we have allowed it, we have sinned and are sinning grievously, and ought never to rest, nor let our rulers rest, until these sentences are swept away as if they had never been. From a report which reached me I hoped I should have to congratulate you on the Attorney-General's declaring that Dr. Colenso has no appeal to the Queen; but I cannot make out the authority for it; you will of course hear if it is so. At any rate I feel sure you have general sympathy here in your proceedings against *him*. . . . The Clerical subscription question, I hear, is likely to result in the substitution of the following for the 2nd and 3rd clauses in the 36th Canon, viz. —That 'he alloweth the 39 Articles *and the Prayer-book,* as *agreeable* to the Word of God,' instead of 'not contrary.' The *assent* and *consent* in the Act of Uniformity will, I imagine, be omitted, only the engagement to use it will remain. I don't think it will make much practical difference, but in theory it sounds rather immoral. The putting the Articles and Prayer-book on the same footing is to me a real and great improvement.

"I grieve over the debate on the Oxford subscription, for I fear it will rather estrange our members from each other. Nor can I like trusting government and tuition to persons only pledged to be *bonâ fide* members of the Church of Eng-

land. I want them to sign the eight first of the thirty-nine Articles; but of this I daresay the Liberals will not hear.

"My wife, I am thankful to say, is better for the West of England. She sends her kind and respectful love to yourself and Mrs. Gray, and I join with her, heart and soul, being always, my dear Bishop of Cape Town, most sincerely and affectionately yours, J. KEBLE."

To this letter Bishop Gray replied:

"Bishop's Court, July 15th, 1864.

"My dear Mr. Keble—Many thanks for your kind letter and friendly counsel. I have no thoughts of separating from the Communion of the Church of England. It must be something very much worse than what has actually taken place to lead me to any overt act of that kind. Nothing can be better than the Archbishop's Pastoral. It is a *de facto* reversal of the Lord Chancellor's judgment, by him to whom the Head of the Church has given authority to judge in matters of faith; and the repudiation of judgment (it is nothing less) by the eleven thousand faithful Clergy is very comforting. It needs but the Synodical condemnation to clear the Church of all complicity in this profane judgment. I confess, however, that I believe that the existing Court of Appeal, having been created to perform duties which our Lord has not given it to perform, will destroy the Church of England if the Church does not repudiate *it;* and I know not how soon it may be the instrument of breaking up the Communion of the Church. At this moment the law officers of the Crown have advised the Crown to refer to *it* questions which could not come before it by the ordinary process of the law, as regards this Colenso affair. Suppose they reply that the Crown could not give powers to the Metropolitan; that Colenso is not legally deprived, because of invalidity in letters patent; and treat the fact of my appointment by the Church in consequence of the decision come to by the meeting of Bishops under the presidency of the late Archbishop as a nullity—am I, having received my commission from our Lord, through His Church, to acquiesce in an

infidel filling the See of Natal, to the destruction of the Body of Christ in that land? God forbid.

"I am bound, still, to excommunicate him; and then, if my brother Bishops will act with me, to consecrate another, if the Archbishop of C. cannot. But, then, in what light will the Church at home regard all this? Will the Bishops still pay Colenso, without being forced to do so by a decree of a Court? If they do, can they or will they recognise as Bishop the true witness for Christ in Natal? These are questions which may be coming on. I cannot, for one, consent to let the Privy Council settle for us who is the true Pastor of that Church, or force an unbeliever on that Church; nor can I take the charge of that Diocese permanently along with my own. It would not answer. The Church there, seeing that we did not or could fill up the post, would break up; some would go over to Colenso as the recognised Bishop, not half understanding his views; some would give up religion altogether. The more earnest would go over to the sects, as many have already done. and the labour of working up that Diocese in its present miserable condition would be beyond my power.

"I have only just come back from my most painfully interesting Visitation. My wife rode with me 700 miles;—great part of it in a beautiful country. I have pledged myself to double the Clergy within a year, if men can be found, and S. P. G. will allow me to appropriate their existing grants." (Here some details of the Visitation are given.) "God has, I hope and believe, overruled events, and guided men's hearts and minds. If Civil Courts do not persecute the Church there, with judgments denying its religious liberties, I can carry the Diocese with me.—Believe me ever, dear Mr. Keble, faithfully and affectionately yours, R. CAPETOWN."

"Church Crookham, Farnham, August 4th, 1864.

"My dear Lord—I must write a few lines, were it only to thank you for your kindness in writing to me in the midst of your overwhelming work, and for your Charge, of which I will only say that it looks to me like a fragment of the fourth century

recovered for the use of the nineteenth. How the matter will be dealt with by the authorities I have no knowledge at all. I hope you will hear from others by this mail something more to the purpose. Our own great anxiety continues, allayed in some measure by what Convocation has done; but in one sense *that* makes me more anxious; the Clergy, *especially the High Church portion,* are so disposed to think the least that is done sufficient. The other sort, on this occasion, are much more in earnest; *e.g.* the Irish parsons sign the Oxford Declaration in the ratio of nine to one; the English, six to one. I got very anxious about it all a fortnight or three weeks ago, and went to London partly on purpose to find whether anything was in preparation against the next session. I saw ——, who told me that there really is a fair chance, but no notice has been given in Parliament. I apprehend that the Bishops have not yet been able to agree sufficiently among themselves; and I also have heard that the hitch is chiefly with W. Ebor., which I can well believe. In the meantime the address to the Archbishops is getting signed very well I imagine, *where the Clergy are hearty about it;* in such degree as it may be a failure, it will be due to the cause above mentioned—I mean the apathy of High Churchmen. I found the poorest and simplest of my parish quite intelligent and quite cordial about it. The personal character of Lord Westbury, which, in Hampshire at least, is well known, adds to their horror at the thing itself. On the whole I returned from London more comfortable than I went, and am satisfied that it is our duty here for the present to wait and see what comes of these promises; but still to keep up the soreness which is so apt to heal of itself. Pusey, who has been communicating with Sir R. Palmer, seems more discouraged. He is about to publish the said Sir R.'s opinion on the legal effect of the judgment, with a preface, which I am to see in proof, and it is possible that he and I may have to come out severally with strong views on the absolute necessity of a change in the law of Appeals, if schism is to be averted; but we must take care—it is so much better in general, as our old friend, Bishop Butler, says, to *under*state than to overstate in such matters

"J. H. Newman's *Apologia* is quite an event. I shall be anxious to know how it strikes you. I can fancy it doing us a great deal of good; assuredly he means it to do so. Some time since I saw a letter of his to Isaac Williams, in which he expressed great grief at this trouble in our Church, and a hearty wish that it might succeed and stand in this crisis, for in this country, he said, it was the only body that could wrestle with infidelity. 'The Catholic Church,' he said, 'has not the power to do so' here. And now he publishes his wish for an 'armed truce' between us and them. I wonder what the Pope will say to it all. The publication has been the greatest relief to J. H. N. himself, and he tells me that, so far, he has had the rare luck to please both parties; but his testimonials from Roman Catholics, as far as I have seen, are not from the Continent. There is a plan for the Bishop of Oxford and George Williams to go out as a Deputation to Russia (D.V.) next year, and influential friends there are said to be preparing the way for them. Some of us want much to know what you think of the Zambesi matter. Now, I can only add my wife's and my own best wishes and prayers for yourself, my dear Lord, and Mrs. Gray, and all yours, and all your works.

"Yours, with deep love and reverence, J. KEBLE."

It has seemed better to keep these interesting letters in direct sequence, although, by doing so, we have run ahead somewhat, and must now go back to a rather earlier date.

March 14th the Bishop wrote to Dr. Williamson:

. . . "You say you think that I am cast down. No. I have had two quiet months, and have been reading more than I have done for many a day, and gathering, perhaps, some mental strength for the struggle which is probably approaching. My difficulties are only just beginning;—the trial is the least part of them. I fully anticipate an appeal to the temporal Courts against the Colonial Bishopric's Council for payment of stipend—perhaps a verdict in Colenso's favour—return to Natal —resumption of spiritual functions, excommunication, and then

the real struggle. Will the Diocese place the appointment of another Bishop in my hands, to be consecrated in the teeth of the Crown without letters patent? Can I find a fit man willing to come out and witness for Christ against Colenso, he having the income, and perhaps the churches, and recognised by officials? Nothing less than this will, humanly speaking, save the Church, and the difficulties of various kinds in the way are manifold; but if it becomes our duty, grace will, I believe, be given to us to see it and to do it. Upon these topics my mind is dwelling. . . . Nothing has more discouraged me or weakened my hands more than the low, worldly, servile view which nearly everybody in England takes of these questions. Well, say they, you have done your duty, whatever be the result of an appeal to the Privy Council. What would a Christian of the first three centuries have said to such a notion? And whatever your state in England may be, ours is that of the three first centuries. Civil Courts have the disposal of all our property, but they have no more right to affect to control my spiritual actions or to bind my conscience, than in the third century to control and bind Cyprian. Well, my dear fellow, I stand pretty much alone in my views, but I am persuaded of them, and, as I said to my advisers at the time, shall have to do penance for not having acted upon them in the case of Long, when the Courts threw their mantle around him because he denied all jurisdiction in spiritual Courts. I mean now to act upon my convictions as far as possible; and if I am beaten in maintaining what I believe to be Christ's Cause, I am beaten. As dear Annie says, in the words of the Church,—God give me wisdom to 'know what things I ought to do, and grace faithfully to fulfil the same.' I have had with me all this morning a worthy Churchman and merchant from Natal, who prays me to go up to that widowed, desolate Church. He says that all life is gone in it. . . . He says that Churchmen are looking to me, and will shut their churches against Colenso; but that with the godless he is popular, because he preaches universal salvation."

April 16th, 1864, was, it will be remembered, the day up to

which it was in Dr. Colenso's power to retract and express his repentance. Accordingly, when that day passed without any sign, the sentence was formally passed, and on the last day of May it was officially served upon the deposed Bishop by Messrs. Brooks and Dubois, Proctors to the Metropolitan. Meanwhile, as we have seen, the Bishop of Cape Town was preparing to visit the unfortunate Diocese. He wrote to his brother (April 4th): "The idea is that Colenso will, by claiming churches, or by an action against me, get into the Natal Court, and from thence to the Privy Council, which, I verily believe, would affect to reinstate him, for this awful and profane judgment would cover all that he has written, and probably was intended to do so. I do not relish this journey and voyage, and dislike it most because of the possibility of a personal collision with Colenso. It is, however, necessary that I should take the charge of the Diocese, and be a rallying point for the faithful, and strengthen their hands. Thank God I can leave my own Diocese without anxiety just now. What is to become of the Church of England if it does not in its Synods repudiate this judgment *in re Essays and Reviews?* Seriously can she be called 'a witness and keeper of Holy Writ' if she does not utterly denounce it, and the wretched Court that framed it? God give her grace to rise up as one man, and say that she will separate from the State if she is to be thus wronged and cheated of her office as a Church to witness for Christ."

In a letter already quoted the Bishop spoke of his coming departure. On April 15th he wrote: "I start (D.V.) to-morrow to take charge of the Diocese, and, if I can, guide it into a right path. It is an anxious time, for it has a poor ministry, and the people have never been taught. . . . The Long Judgment is now a thing of the past, and yet a poor coloured congregation sent me their little offering last week of £2 : 10s. in diminution of my expenses. . . . I have worn out my eyes with writing since I determined to go. Just now I have to settle about the future of the Zambesi. Keble writes me most loving letters, and Pusey too, and Denison, in the tone of the shield, the sword, and the battle. And the Bishop of Lincoln

and Archdeacon Bickersteth, both full of sense and readiness for action. The real struggle is now coming on;—hitherto it has been skirmishing. Now it is with the world clothed in ermine. God defend the right. Colenso has been advised by his friends (it comes from letters to a friend here) not to publish his Part V., which contains an attack worse than in Part IV. on the New Testament, till this matter is settled. 'We wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places.'"

To the Bishop of Oxford the Metropolitan wrote:—

"Bishop's Court, April 14th, 1864.

"My dear Bishop—I start (D.V.) for Natal on Saturday, Colenso ceasing that day to be Bishop. I wish that we may hear of a man willing to come out and trust to God for a maintenance, and, at the same time, well qualified to fill a very difficult post. I am asking Archdeacon Bickersteth to look out, and be a referee. The Archbishop's letters to me are very nice. Surely these two things are essential:—I. The repudiation of the judgment by the Synods of the Church. II. A demand upon the part of the Church for the suppression of the Court of Appeal, and a return to the principles and practices of the Reformation as to these matters.

"Gladstone's letter to the Bishop of London after the Gorham Judgment is full of matter for these times. His abiding by his views and acting them out at this crisis should be the test of his adherence to or abandonment of the Church.

"I hope that all will not evaporate in useless protests. The Church will speak boldly, if it feels strongly, and, if bold, will have its way. This horrid, crushing, stifling result of modern notions of the Supremacy is ruining the Church. It is undermining men's faith in her. The Court of Appeal must be overthrown, or the Church will perish. It has done more during the thirty years of its existence to drive men to Rome than all the writings of all the Romanists during that time."

Accordingly, on April 16th, 1864, the Bishop and Mrs. Gray embarked in the coasting steamer "Dane," stopping one night at Port Elizabeth, and, after a tedious voyage, battling with contrary winds, they landed at Port Natal on the 26th; Archdeacon Fearne and others of the Clergy and Laity waiting on the quay to receive and greet them heartily.

Some days were spent in D'Urban, where there was much to be done. "All represent the state of the Diocese as most deplorable" (the Bishop's Journal of May 28th says): "the Clergy diminished in numbers, and disheartened; the Laity distracted, some of them perverted." Mr. and Mrs. Robertson, the devoted Zululand Missionaries, came down just then, and the Bishop was glad to have much discussion with Mr. Robertson concerning his work, and they visited the Umlazi Mission Station together.

The sentence of Dr. Colenso's deprivation was to be read on Sunday 31st in all churches of the Colony. On the Saturday the Bishop heard that there were some people disturbed about this, and a protest signed by twenty-seven persons was sent in. On inquiry he found that the general idea was that it was a sentence of excommunication. There was a crowded congregation on the Sunday at both services—the Bishop preaching, in the morning on Faith, and in the evening on the Inspiration of the written Word. When the sentence was read after the Nicene Creed, about eighteen or twenty people walked out, but nothing could be more reverent and devout than the general congregation, and there were the usual number of communicants. The Bishop's Journal notes that he was very much exhausted with this day's services, chiefly because of the painful circumstances attending them. The ignorance and want of comprehension with which he had to deal may be seen from the following passage:—

"May 2nd.

"One of my visitors, a great friend of Bishop Mackenzie, told me that though in church yesterday, he had believed, until Mr. Robertson undeceived him, that I had excommunicated Dr. Colenso during the service, and that that was the general

belief. He told me also that the idea of some was that this was persecution, and that I had no authority whatever, by letters patent, or oaths taken by Dr. Colenso, over him as my Suffragan. I gave him my letters patent to read, and the oath taken by the late Bishop on his consecration. He was amazed! He told me that he really believed that, with the exception of a very few, the laity generally repudiated Dr. Colenso's teaching, and would never wish to see him back in Natal again; but that they knew nothing of the office of Metropolitan, and thought that I wished to make myself a Pope, and did not like 'Table Mountain Government.' I had a long conversation with him about the nature and constitution of the Church, Civil Courts, etc. It is thus that difficulties and trials and misconceptions force men to think and examine for themselves. If they are right-minded men, and have no personal objects to serve, they never fail in time to see the truth. In the evening, one of the churchwardens came to express his regret for his own misconceptions, and to assure me that he and his colleague would gladly co-operate in any plans I might have for the benefit of the place or Diocese. . . . It seems that a few people here who caused great anxiety, and offered much opposition to Bishop Mackenzie when he was placed here, have been endeavouring to get up an agitation, and that they have signally failed."

On May 3rd the Metropolitan and Mrs. Gray left for Pieter Maritzburg, stopping by the way at Camperdown to minister to the last hours of a traveller who had just before been taken ill and was dying in the inn. After endeavouring to comfort the poor widow as far as might be, they went on, and were met on the road by Dean Green and some friendly laymen. It was fourteen years since the Bishop and Dean had met, and there were indeed weighty matters before them both for discussion. "The feeling against the Bishop seems very general" (says the Journal of May 7th), "in spite of much to attract personally, and many acts of kindness shown by him to individuals, and appreciated by them. I cannot hear of more than two or three people in this place, known to be infected by his teaching. The great body of Church people shrink from his views, though

scarce knowing the extent to which he has carried them. They do not, however, see their way clearly as to the future. The case is of so novel a character, that plain people may well be perplexed and puzzled as to the relation of the Bishop to the Metropolitan, and that of the Metropolitan to the Primate of all England. . . . The time that has been lost, to say nothing of other things, has been a great evil. People feel, very keenly, that the Bishop has been spending the last two years of his life in publishing infidel books in England, instead of doing his own proper work. . . . The work must languish, the Church must die out in this land, unless for the next few years the Mother Church will help it in its affliction. We have all of us contributed to inflict a great blow upon it, by sending out one who has undermined its life, by instilling the poison of unbelief into it. We must all come to its succour in its hour of weakness and danger, and provide it for a time, and largely at our own cost, with true and faithful pastors. It is, at this hour, the weakest of all the Church's outposts; and it is in greater danger than any other."

On May 10th they rode out to Ekukanyeni, the late Bishop's residence, about five miles from the town, built on about 8,000 acres of valuable land given by the Government partly for a Mission Station, and partly as an endowment for the See. Here Bishop Colenso had begun a native institution, long since abandoned. They found one Zulu printing some part of the New Testament, and two Zulu catechists with whom Mr. Robertson had some conversation, but everything looked very desolate, and the Metropolitan's heart was filled with sadness as he thought how different a state of things he had once looked for. Mr. Robertson had a long talk with the pet Zulu (William by name) who is constantly instanced by Dr. Colenso in his books as suggesting doubts and difficulties, and who now was teaching that there is no resurrection and no eternal punishment. From William's own remarks, we might be inclined to infer that he had rather been the recipient than the originator of the aforesaid doubts and difficulties; for he told Mr. Robertson that he had attended carefully to the Bishop's teaching—he always sup-

posed so clever a man could hardly be wrong, but he simply wished to teach what the Church teaches.

Bishop Gray visited all around, going, among other places,[1] to Mr. Barter's farm in a beautiful situation some 1,800 feet above Maritzburg, to Shafton, Kar Kloof Falls, etc. On Whitsun Day he preached twice in the Cathedral to crowded congregations, on the subject of the day, and with special reference to the present needs of the Church. On Whitsun Tuesday the Bishop went to meet Dr. Duff, whose letter on arriving in Cape Town has been already mentioned. The gathering was at the house of Mr. Buchanan, editor of one of the Maritzburg papers, and was a large one. It turned into a sort of Missionary meeting, Dr. Duff giving some interesting recollections of Bishop Heber, and accounts of his own work. "He is one of those large-hearted men" (the Metropolitan writes) "whose Christianity is above all sectarian feeling, and who would be prepared to sacrifice everything for the faith."

On May 18th the Metropolitan held his Visitation in the Cathedral, his Charge occupying two and a half hours in delivery.[2] In it he went fully into the late Bishop's teaching, and into all the questions of mutual relations of Bishop Metropolitan and Patriarch, the relation of State to Church in South

[1] On Whitsun Monday the Bishop visited Miss Barter's Mission Station, about six miles from Maritzburg. "She has erected a small house upon land amounting to one hundred acres given by Government, and she has gathered a few people around her. She came out to labour among the natives, and has done so very devotedly for some years."

[2] "The most assiduous collector of theological pamphlets may search his shelves in vain for anything bearing the name of an Episcopal Charge that can be compared with that which has recently reached us from Natal. . . . It is no mere treatise or disquisition, read for the fulfilment of the Bishop's professional duties at a triennial meeting of his Clergy. It is the statement of a great argument, on which depend issues no less important than the life and liberty of the Church. And the statement comes from one who is avowedly the great actor in the struggle. A character less firm and a temper less ardent would have quailed before the risks and distresses that could not but attend on such a measure as the formal deposition of a Comprovincial Bishop on the score of heretical teaching. Of those distresses no one can foretell the end. But the voice of the Metropolitan rings out as clear as if there were no legal perils in his path, no machinations of enemies, no lukewarmness of friends, to be feared. . . . Our own persuasion is—assuming the judgment to be theologically correct—that his course is not less wise

Africa, the independence of Colonial Churches of Civil Courts, the true standing-ground of the Church, etc.

Before the ordinary Visitation dinner an address was presented to the Metropolitan, signed by all the Clergy of the Diocese. After expressing their sympathy and gratitude to Bishop Gray, they went on to "place on record our emphatic repudiation of the erroneous teaching of Bishop Colenso, and our conviction that, should it please God for the chastisement of our sins to allow him to return to this Diocese with legal authority, he must still be regarded as lying under a righteous sentence of condemnation, and that we dare not acknowledge him as having authority in spiritual matters."

In his reply the Metropolitan said that "we ought not to suppose that any Civil Court would, if appealed to on the question of civil right, venture to send back to this land one whose teaching you yourselves, with the whole Church, have solemnly repudiated, with the right to take possession of the property of the Church, given for different purposes. . . . Our country's Courts will not commit the great wrong of giving a legal right to a Bishop deposed and rejected by the Church to force himself into your churches, and proclaim from your pulpits 'erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's Word,' which he and you have sworn at your ordination 'with all faithful dili-

than bold. . . . The deposed Prelate contends that the final resort in all ecclesiastical causes is the Crown, and his petition still stands for hearing. . . . The jurisdiction which Bishop Colenso invokes is confessedly destitute of statutory authority. If the Crown is to review the judgment of a Colonial Metropolitan, its right to do so must rest on principles long since abandoned in practice, if not actually contrary to law. . . . If the Queen, acting by a select number of Privy Councillors, could reinstate a deposed heretical Bishop in his place, the Church would be in a very much worse position than any other religious society in the British empire—in so bad a position, indeed, that it would be foolish to expect her members to submit to it. . . . Bishop Colenso would be a State officer without a flock to govern, disowned by his order, and repudiated by the Society which sent him forth. We can hardly believe that he would care to accept so anomalous a position in the forlorn hope of using the authority of his title to give his peculiar views weight. On this contingency, however, it is vain to speculate. At present we have but to congratulate the Bishop of Cape Town on the undaunted spirit with which he maintains the liberties of the Church, and the integrity of the Christian faith."—See leader in *Guardian* of August 10, 1864.

gence to banish and drive away.' . . . But if it were so, your course is plain. Christians have, before now, been driven to worship on the mountain-top or the river-side, in dens and caves of the earth."

The next day, May 19th, a Conference met at the Cathedral, consisting of all the Clergy of the Diocese except two, who were ill, and about an equal number of laity. After prayer, the Metropolitan put before them the three objects he wished to consider with them :—

I. The present condition of the Diocese as regards means of grace for the Europeans, and Missions for the conversion of the heathen.

II. Whether there was any desire on the part of the Clergy and laity of the Diocese that any Clergyman now in South Africa should succeed to the office of Bishop in Natal.

III. Whether the Conference desired to express to the Metropolitan any wish as to the steps to be taken by him in securing the appointment of another Bishop.

On the first of these points opinion was unanimous, rather to let the Clergy minister to the English and Kafir population in combination, than to increase the number of Mission stations, the contrary system tending, as experience proved, to create a feeling of mischievous separation between races.

On the second point some strong desires were expressed to have the Dean of Cape Town as the future Bishop, but this seemed undesirable on account of the part he had been obliged to take in the late Bishop's trial. The Metropolitan explained that he merely wished to know the views of the Clergy and representatives of the laity, against the time when the selection might be made, whether by the Archbishop of Canterbury, Colonial Secretary of State, or Metropolitan.

On the third point the Conference had no suggestion to make, and the Metropolitan said that he thought any decided step at this moment by the Church of Africa would be premature. It would, on every ground, be better to wait, and endeavour to obtain the appointment of a Bishop in the usual way, by the Archbishop, etc. But, he added, if unfortunately

any civil court should affect to reinstate Dr. Colenso, he having been deposed by the Church, the Metropolitan would, God helping him, come with his suffragans, and consecrate another Bishop in that very Cathedral. He said that, believing it to be a matter of life and death to the Church, he dared not do otherwise; he could not hereafter stand before his Lord if, at such a crisis, he stood patiently by while the wolf devoured the sheep; it was in truth simply a matter of conscience to him. "What I believe Christ would have me do, that I will do at any cost, for the saving of His Body from ruin." A resolution was then passed to the effect that Dr. Colenso would not be acknowledged as Bishop in consequence of his wide departure from the faith of the Church.

A letter written before leaving Maritzburg by Dr. Duff is worthy of remark, as tending to show the strong feeling drawn out by others than members of the English Church:—

"Maritzburg, May 19th, 1864.

"My Lord Bishop—It was my privilege yesterday to hear the Charge delivered by your Lordship to the Clergy of the English Church in this Diocese. The occasion was one of pre-eminent solemnity, the subject one of life and death importance to every branch of the Evangelical Church of Christ throughout the world. On the principle that when one member of the body suffers, all the members suffer, I have felt intensely the deep wound which has been inflicted on your noble branch of the Universal Church; and through it on every other that holds by the Head,—Christ the Lord of Glory, the Lord our Righteousness. On this account I cherish an inward consciousness that you will not be disposed to regard any reference on my part to the services of yesterday as an intrusion. With certain portions of your Lordship's Charge, such as the office itself of Metropolitan, the question of jurisdiction in the present instance, I do not feel myself called on in any way to intermeddle or to pronounce any judgment at such a time as this. These are matters respecting which the wisest and holiest of men have differed, and will continue to differ. Sufficient for

me, on an occasion like the present, that the office of Metropolitan is in strict accordance with the Ecclesiastical polity of the Church of England, and therefore one in which all the members of that Church ought to acquiesce. . . . What I, as a professing disciple of the Lord Jesus Christ, feel deeply, vitally concerned with, is the grand subject-matter of the Charge, as an emphatic testimony against Gospel-extinguishing heresies, and in favour of those glorious fundamental verities which constitute the very Gospel of Grace and Salvation.

"Considering the extreme peculiarity of the occasion and the circumstances, I know not that I ever listened with more real heartfelt enjoyment to any statement or vindication of the foundation doctrines of our Common Christian Faith, than when listening yesterday to your Lordship's noble Charge. There was transparent clearness in happy combination with intrepid firmness and indomitable strength. It was worthy of any of the Fathers of ancient, or any of the Reformers of modern times, viewed as a martyr-like testimony to the assailed essential verities of the Jehovah's Holy Oracles. I have thanked God, and will ever continue to thank God, for that noble testimony. Excuse me for writing thus;—what I feel I like to express; what I feel strongly I cannot but express strongly. . . . Very sincerely yours, ALEXANDER DUFF."

The Bishop went on to Richmond, Springvale, etc., returning to Maritzburg, whence he wrote wearily, though hopefully and trustfully.

"I feel getting old," he says in one letter, "but, thank God, I am still able to go through my work." On June 1st he and Mrs. Gray started, accompanied by the Dean, for the Umgeni, holding services and visiting at various places;—Estcourt, Colenso, Ladismith, Greytown, the Noodsberg, Verulam, etc., reaching D'Urban on the 15th. Here among others the Wesleyan Superintendent came forward with earnest thanks to Bishop Gray for "his decided, noble, and persevering stand" in defence of hallowed doctrines which are the heritage of all Christians. When the Metropolitan said in the course of con-

versation that he would consecrate a faithful Bishop for the Diocese under shelter of a tree, if driven out of the Cathedral by the strong hand of mere secular power, the old gentleman expressed his hearty delight, and said he would come and "raise the psalm tune!"

The Berea, Clairmont, the Ispingo, the Umzinto, Ungababa, the Illovo, made a round occupying a week; and on returning to D'Urban, the Bishop's tender heart was saddened by finding among other letters one from Mr. Robertson, from whom he had so lately parted, with tidings of his wife's death by an accident. It was after crossing the river Tugela, and in descending a piece of very rough ground, that their wagon was upset, and some heavy boxes fell upon Mrs. Robertson and crushed her.

"The Church had not two more loving and devoted labourers in her service," the Bishop wrote. "Mrs. Robertson was full of love for the native race; and she was full of zeal, gentleness, devotedness, and even enthusiasm, for the work. . . . Her husband goes back to a desolate home, to labour, as he says, with more entire devotion to his Master's service. But I fear for him. He is not a strong man, and of earthly comforts and supports he has but a small share in his distant and solitary outpost. Marvellous are God's dealings. We see not now why such strokes are permitted to fall, but we shall know hereafter. I cannot but contrast my happier lot, I trust with gratitude, to that of my poor friend."

It was on June 25th that the English mail brought tidings of Dr. Colenso's proceedings.

"I hear," the Bishop writes, "that Bishop Colenso has petitioned the Crown to hear his Appeal against the sentence of the Metropolitan, and that the law officers of the Crown have, in consequence of the many difficult legal and constitutional questions raised thereby, advised that his petition be referred to the Judicial Committee of Privy Council for their consideration. If this be so, it seems to me that the recommendation (while it may lead to the settlement of important questions) is open to some serious objections. This, at least

seems clear, that the Judicial Committee of Privy Council (or the Crown through it) is not, by any law, a Court of Appeal from a sentence of the Metropolitan of this Province; for if it were, the appellant might have gone at once to it and sought redress there. It is only because the Privy Council could not hear him that he petitions the Crown to order it to do so. He asks the Crown to assume, by a stretch of the prerogative, functions which no law or custom or consent of this Church assigns to it. It is certain that no statute law gives this right, for even if there were Acts of Parliament which give it in the case of persons circumstanced as he is, in England or elsewhere, those Acts have, by treaty, no force here. It is plain that no consent gives it. If the letters patent be worth nothing else, they at least serve to show what was the understanding upon which the Church and Province were founded. They are evidence of the consent of the Crown—of the Mother Church as represented by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and of the Church here, as represented by myself—being given at the period of the formation of the Province, to Appeals to Canterbury from the Metropolitan, and to no other quarter. We mutually contracted that such should be the case, and I accepted my office upon that condition. Had it been proposed that the Privy Council should have been our Court of Appeal, I should have felt bound to protest against it, this Church having, in the year 1850, made a solemn Declaration in Synod, which was forwarded to the Archbishop of Canterbury, to the effect that they could not consider the Judicial Committee of Privy Council as their Court for deciding matters of faith.

"The grave objection which cannot but be felt to exist to the course actually pursued is this—that it refers it to the Privy Council to say absolutely whether or not it shall be a Court of Appeal for us. If it says that it will be so, there is no remedy; nothing but an Act of Parliament could set aside that decision, and that of course could not be obtained. It is therefore invited to decide whether or not it will assume powers which no law or consent on our part have conferred upon it, and there are no means open whereby this Church

could rid itself of the effect of that decision. It is to be hoped that the distinguished lawyers who are certain to sit for the hearing of this petition will disclaim the functions with which Dr. Colenso is anxious to invest them. Having already decided that we are a purely voluntary religious association, in no better, but in no worse position than other religious bodies (in Long *v.* Bishop of Cape Town); and a great judge (Lord Campbell), with three other learned judges as assessors, having decided, in a case often referred to as authoritative, that Bishops of Colonial Churches are not, like the English and Irish Bishops, prelates of a Church which is the Established Church of England and Ireland; that they have nothing in common with them, but that they are 'Protestant Bishops canonically consecrated, and holding the faith of the Anglican Church' (Queen *v.* Eton College); we claim to be free from all the peculiarities which attach to the Mother Church as the Established Church of England, and trust that we may never be forced, by a decision to which we could not submit, into a contest for the maintenance of our religious liberties. Looking, however, as I am bound to do, to the possibility of such an issue, and to the probable schism which would be the result of it, I cannot but regret that when no court of law would hear the case, because there is none entitled to do so, the Crown should have been advised to come to the Appellant's relief, and bring the cause under its own cognisance, by the extraordinary course which has been adopted. There are cases upon which, I understand, the Crown can and does consult the Privy Council—there was an instance with regard to this very Colony. When a judge was suspended by a former Lieutenant-Governor, the Privy Council was consulted on some point connected with that act. But these were officers of the Crown, acting under the sole authority of the Crown. The cases are not analogous. We are officers of the Church, not of the State, and in this case the rights and liberties of the Church are intimately concerned. The Crown appears to me to have been advised to consider whether it is entitled to do, in this very important case which affects the religious liberties of a large portion of its subjects,

what by the Act 16 Char. I., c. 11, it was prohibited from doing as regards the Established Church—*i.e.*, to constitute the Privy Council, by its sole act, and without the authority of Parliament or the consent of the Church or Court for the revision of the acts and proceedings of this branch of the Church, thereby bringing it immediately under the control of the Crown and the Council. In other words, it appears to me to be in some danger of taking a step towards the revival of the Star Chamber (which was only the Privy Council meeting in the Star Chamber) for the government of the Colonial Churches. I shall be glad to find myself mistaken in this, but so far as I can see the step is unconstitutional, and full of danger to the liberties of the Colonial Churches. But this is not my only ground of regret. The issue, so far as this Church and myself are concerned, is raised, and our liberties are hazarded, perhaps necessarily, upon an imperfect and partial statement of the case.

"I claim to be Metropolitan of S. Africa, not merely because jurisdiction is given to me by letters patent, but because the Church also appointed me to that office, having decided before the Diocese was divided, at a meeting summoned by the late Archbishop of Canterbury for the consideration of this and other questions, that there should be a Metropolitan of S. Africa, and that the Bishop of Cape Town should fill that office. Dr. Colenso took the oaths of canonical obedience to me as Metropolitan, both at his consecration, before the issue of the letters patent, and after their issue as his own letters patent required. If, therefore, it were desired to obtain the opinion of the Privy Council in this whole case, for the benefit of all the parties concerned, a wider view of the subject should, I think, have been taken than Dr. Colenso's petition is likely to do. The Council should have been asked if the whole case of this Church were to be before it, whether, if the Crown could not appoint a Metropolitan, the Church was debarred from doing so? Whether there was any law to prevent her from doing for those in communion with her in distant lands, what Romanists and Wesleyans could freely do for those in communion with them?

—*e.g.* give to her members that full and complete constitution of the Church and of the powers belonging to the several offices therein, which is essential, if not to its being, yet at least to its well-being. I regret that only half the case will be submitted to the Privy Council. It is not right to hazard our religious liberties upon a mere constitutional or legal question such as that to be submitted. And the hardship to myself and to the Church is this, that if the decision were to be against the Crown, and it was affirmed that for it to create a Metropolitan was *ultra vires*, or that there was any defect in my letters patent, and that consequently I had no legal jurisdiction over Bishop Colenso, the question as to the right to deprive him of his office of Bishop would by the world be supposed to be settled in his favour; and the highest Court of Judicature in the Empire would be regarded as ruling that the Church in this land has no power to remove a Bishop even though he were an infidel, or a murderer, or an adulterer;—while it would really have given no opinion on that point, and would say, if asked, that that question had never been submitted to it. Thus my own difficulties and those of the Church here may be greatly increased by the course which has been adopted, and we may have to carry on our struggle to maintain the faith and discipline of the Church in this land, seemingly, though not really, against the whole weight of the authority of the Crown and of the Privy Council. I need scarcely assure the Church that the struggle would be carried on, under whatever disadvantages, because we believe that to allow Dr. Colenso to resume his office as a Bishop of this Church would simply be to betray our Lord and to destroy His Church. We dare not leave the sheep of Christ's Fold to be devoured by the wolf, to become the prey of the unbeliever. We should feel constrained, in faithfulness to our Master, to appoint another Pastor to watch over the flock. Every portion of the Church of Christ has not only a right to do this, but is bound to do it. The law of man does not give the right, nor can it take that right away. The Church cannot part with her right nor abandon her responsibilities in such a matter, without being unfaithful to

her Lord. "His Bishopric let another take" is to be her rule in every age, if any should "by transgression fall." For courts, or other powers of the world, to deny her rights in this matter, would be to persecute. To say that we must receive back again an unbeliever, because the Crown had not the power to give the Church *legal* jurisdiction over him, which it has sought to give, would be to subject us to grievous wrong; we could not for a moment bow to such a decision. Be it that we are without legal powers, we are then only in the same condition as other religious bodies. The Privy Council has itself affirmed that if we are in no better we are in no worse position than they. We have therefore as much right to put in force our discipline as the Wesleyans have, and they can deprive their officers. We ask for no more liberty than they enjoy;—we will not be content with less. For the exercise of this we have our Lord's authority and commission. We need no higher."

Meanwhile, on June 27th, 1864, the first step was taken by Dr. Colenso in the matter of his petition to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. There were present the Lord Chancellor (Lord Westbury), Lord Wensleydale, Lord Kingsdown, Lord Cranworth, Lord Chelmsford, Sir Edward Ryan, and Sir J. T. Coleridge. Mr. James, Q.C., Mr. Fitzjames Stephens, and Mr. Westlake, appeared for Dr. Colenso. No counsel appeared on the part of the Bishop of Cape Town or the prosecutors, the proceedings being *ex parte*. The petition prayed that her Majesty would be pleased to declare the petitioner entitled to hold his See until the letters patent granted to him should be cancelled by due process of law for some sufficient cause of forfeiture, and to declare that the letters patent granted to the Bishop of Cape Town, in so far as they purported to create a Court of Criminal Justice within the Colony, and to give to the Archbishop of Canterbury an appellate jurisdiction, had been unduly obtained from her Majesty, and did not affect the petitioner's rights. He also "prayed that the pretended trial and sentence were void and of no effect, and that an inhibition, as was usual in ecclesiastical cases,

should issue against the proceedings under the sentence pending the appeal." The Lord Chancellor ordered the petition to stand over for six months, with liberty to Dr. Colenso to serve the petition on such persons as he might desire. Their Lordships declined for the present to entertain the question of inhibition, since to grant it would be to assume jurisdiction on the part of the Bishop of Cape Town. Dr. Colenso was present all the time.

Space makes it absolutely necessary to refrain scrupulously from entering upon what was at this time an absorbing object of interest among Churchmen, and of exciting debate in convocation—the *Essays and Reviews* subject. But it was impossible not to feel that this case and the no less weighty one of Dr. Colenso, his heresies and his deposition, hung together, and probably no Churchman throughout the land, in spite of all justice and reason, imagined that the Privy Council would give a judgment favourable to the Church or the Faith. Probably, too, the mind of most Churchmen was fairly expressed by a leader of the *Guardian* for July 6th, 1864, when saying that it might be conceived no one would feel it a matter of conscience to defer to a ruling of Lord Chancellor Westbury on a question of Christian doctrine; or that, were the name of her Majesty to be added, and the concurrence of Lord Kingsdown, an ex-chancellor or two, and one or both of the Lord Justices, it would make much difference. Yet this, with the concurrence (necessarily in criminal cases, possibly in others) of either the Prelates of Canterbury, York, or London, was the voice substantially claiming to pronounce absolutely and without appeal as to what was to be held as true and sound doctrine, or the reverse! No wonder that all the highest feeling and principle of the country revolted against such a "strange doctrine!"

It was while these proceedings were going on at home that Bishop Gray was scanning over a so-called pastoral letter from Dr. Colenso to the Laity of Natal;[1] and in a speech made at

[1] "The burden of the letter from the beginning to the end is simply, 'Great is the Committee of the Privy Council,' the supreme and ultimate authority on the principles of the Christian Faith! There is a flourish about the 'blood of the Reformers,' introduced with happy contempt of logic and history. But there is

D'Urban on S. Peter's Day (the seventeenth anniversary of his consecration) the Bishop felt it necessary to take some notice of certain untrue statements which it contained concerning himself, and which he thought it would be wrong to leave uncontradicted.

"As to such points as his letters patent being issued a few days before mine, or my having appointed Bishops Tozer and Twells so that his judges were my nominees, they are hardly worth noticing. I might, however, remark, that if Bishop Colenso had not seen my letters patent it was his own fault. They were in the public offices, they were open to all, and they were not the first letters patent that had been issued in relation to Metropolitans." The Bishop briefly repeated the circumstances of appointment of both the prelates named, reminding his listeners that Bishop Tozer had not been one of the judges, and that he had had nothing to do personally with the appointment either of the Bishop of Graham's Town or S. Helena, both of whom formally adhered to the judgment. But there were other points of greater importance which must be entered upon. In his letter Dr. Colenso charged the Metropolitan with a long-formed intention of separating the African Church from the Church of England. He said, "I have always resisted the notion of separation from the National Church, on which the Metropolitan has so long been insisting."

"Such language," Bishop Gray went on to say, "was simply intended as an appeal to the people's prejudices. I entirely repudiate so gross an imputation. I am a Bishop's son. I was brought up in the Communion of the Church of England, which I dearly love as the purest and truest Church on earth. I have ministered at her altars; it was against my will that I came out to Africa; until called to go forth I had never felt any inclination for foreign work, but wished to live and die in the service of my Mother Church, and therefore declined to go until summoned a second time by Archbishop Howley, now

no arithmetic, and Dr. Colenso, when not arithmetical, is nothing. If the Laity of Natal are induced by this pamphlet to alter their views, they must be easy of persuasion indeed!"—Leader, *Guardian* of May 11th, 1864.

with God. I entered to-day on the eighteenth year of my Episcopate, and feel it hard that, after spending seventeen years of great toil and many anxieties in endeavouring to extend our Church in Africa, I should have been publicly charged, by one who would not have ventured to make that charge in my presence, and had never hinted at it in all our intercourse (which on my part was always confidential and brotherly), with a long-cherished desire to separate the Church in this land from the Church of England! Such a desire never found entrance into my mind! I entirely deny and repudiate it. I have never concealed what my views are. We are one with the Church of England in faith and discipline and communion. We are the same Church, and I trust we shall ever remain such, neither of us falling away from the one true Faith; but the Church in England is *established*, while here it is not established. The highest Court of law has declared that we are a purely voluntary religious association, and that consequently we have nothing to do with the laws which establish the Church in England, *i.e.*, with statute law or Civil Courts. With these we have absolutely no concern; with all that the Church herself has ruled we are absolutely one. Most of our present difficulties and misconceptions arise from the transition state in which we are; from the transplanting a branch of the Established Church in England to a country where it is *not* established. As to titles, Churches have in all ages been designated by the countries to which they went. The Churches of Rome, Ephesus, Corinth, were called in apostolic days by the names of those places, while they were absolutely one Church with the Mother Church in Jerusalem; they were the one Church of Christ throughout the world. So in our day we have Churches in all parts of our dominions, one in Faith and Communion with the Mother Church in England. They do not cease to be one Church with her because their titles may be taken from Australia, or India, or Canada, or South Africa."

There was another point on which the Metropolitan had somewhat to say. Dr. Colenso had claimed for himself to be the representative of the principles of the Reformation, while

his Metropolitan was seeking to impose upon the people "a system of ecclesiastical despotism;" the "yoke of ecclesiastical tradition," depriving them of the liberty which "the blood of the Reformers" had won for them! Bishop Gray observed that he had read history amiss if the Reformers had not held the Bible to be the Word of God, and the Rule of Faith; if they had not held the Creeds to be the true interpretation of the written Word, because they were what the Church taught and held to be such from the beginning; if they had not fought for primitive apostolic Catholic truth, and rejected the corruptions of Rome because they were incrustations upon and additions to the Primitive Faith. Our Reformers always referred back to the First Ages as teaching what true Christianity was. But the late Bishop, Dr. Colenso, who now came forward as the champion of the Reformation, had taught that the Bible is not God's Word—that the Creeds are old worn-out documents, were "ecclesiastical traditions," that we are "steadily advancing" into greater liberty and light than the world has ever yet enjoyed, and that we may believe the old traditionary system has been, like the Jewish before it, our schoolmaster by God's appointment to bring us to Christ—to the Christ which is to be! This was to be our new religion according to Dr. Colenso. Not the Christ of history—not faith in Him Who is the Same yesterday, to-day, and for ever—not in Him Who was and is our Incarnate God; but in a new Christ, the creation and fabrication of our own intellect! His teaching was an entire departure from what had ever been held to be the Christian Faith from the beginning until now.

Before the Metropolitan left D'Urban, the Dean laid before him and the assembled Clergy a letter just received from S. P. G. announcing that the Society's grant would be reduced the following year from £1850 to £1270, out of which £400 was to be applied to Clergy ministering to the white population, and that no one was to receive more than £100 henceforth from the Society. This announcement aroused much bitterness of feeling, coming, as it did, at so critical a moment for the unfortunate Diocese of Natal, which was threatened with the return of

Dr. Colenso, probably accompanied by men of his own peculiar views and with funds. The Metropolitan ventured to assure the Clergy that the Society, when informed of the real state of things, would not play into Dr. Colenso's hands by withdrawing grants at this moment so wholly essential; but if by any possibility they did so, he promised to go to England himself, to raise the funds and find the men which he had led the Diocese to look for.

On July 2nd, 1864, the Metropolitan embarked for Cape Town, coming in for a more than ordinarily severe storm, during which the little steamer could make no way, though she rode it out well. Bishop Gray was kept to his berth for two days and three nights, and, as he lay there, he "thought of the storm-tossed Church, threatened by more fierce winds and waves than those which seemed likely to overwhelm us. May our Good Lord hear His people's cry, Save, Lord, we perish! and bring it safe through its fiery trial, and purify it thereby!"

During the voyage the following letter was written:—

To JOHN MOWBRAY, Esq.

"At Sea, July 11th, 1864.

"My dear Mowbray—I have no objection to any subscriptions, but shall be thankful for any relief under the pressure of heavy expenses.[1] . . . All that I do object to is to having it

[1] A printed circular from Oxford, without date, probably is to be referred to this time.

"Members of the University are respectfully informed that a subscription in aid of the funds for defraying the legal expenses of the Bishop of Cape Town has been opened at the Old Bank, to which it is hoped that those who feel interest in the welfare of the Church in that distant province will take an early opportunity of contributing.

(Signed) F. C. PLUMPTRE, D.D., Master of University College.
J. E. SEWELL, D.D., Warden of New College.
F. K. LEIGHTON, D.D., Warden of All Souls' College.
F. BULLEY, D.D., President of Magdalen College.
C. C. CLERKE, D.D., Archdeacon of Oxford.
R. W. JELF, D.D., Canon of Christchurch.
E. B. PUSEY, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew.
C. A. OGILVIE, D.D., Regius Professor of Pastoral Theology.
W. W. SHIRLEY, M.A., R. Pro. of Ecclesiastical History.
C. A. HEURTLEY, D.D., Margaret Professor of Divinity.
J. W. BURGON, M.A., Fellow of Oriel.

supposed that I mean to be a party to any suit before the Privy Council, or other Civil Court. I cannot understand the course which the law officers of the Crown have resolved to adopt. The attempt to bring a Colonial spiritual cause under its review, which could not come under its review through the ordinary course of the law, seems to me a most unwarrantable stretch of the prerogative; and very like the re-establishment of the Star Chamber for the subjugation of the Colonial Churches. I am protesting against this.

"Then the submission only of the question of the letters patent seems to me most one-sided and unfair. Let the letters patent be rubbish. What then? The Bishops of the Church, summoned by the late Archbishop for the consideration of the question, resolved that Cape Town should be a Metropolitan's See, and I Metropolitan. I claim that office on the ground that I have been called to it by Christ through His Church. If any questions were asked of the Privy Council, this should have been among the number—If the Crown cannot by letters patent create a Metropolitan, is there any law to prevent the Church from giving this completion of her acknowledged constitution to the Churches which she has founded in various lands, by the appointment of one of her Bishops in each country to act as Metropolitan?

"I would compel the Privy Council to say yea or nay; Whether the Church can or cannot do what the Wesleyans can do? The unfairness to me and to the Church is, that if the Privy Council say the Queen had no power to create Metropolitans, the world will cry out '*Causa finita est*,' and my difficulties will be increased a thousandfold. I believe that if the Privy Council can throw the Church it will; and I believe that the Church must defy and destroy it as a Court of Appeal, or be destroyed by it. In that body all the enmity of the world against the Church of Christ is gathered up and embodied. No justice in spiritual things is to be expected from it. The state of the Diocese of Natal is most shocking. . . . But the laity are very ignorant, and not a few put their faith upon the broken reed of the Privy Council."

To the Rev. the Hon. HENRY DOUGLAS.

"D'Urban, July 2nd, 1864.

. . . "There are two points I have been anxious about. 1. That I should not be understood to be sending my cap begging round England for myself. 2. That I should in no way be represented as prepared to go to the Privy Council or any Civil Court in the Colenso matter. I have said that I would not do this, and I do not wish to appear hesitating or inconsistent. What you have done is precisely what I told my brother some time since I thought would raise enough to relieve me from costs incurred in the Church's service, which have pressed heavily upon me. . . . Altogether in this extra way I have spent full £2,000, and have had to part with some of my own inheritance which I had trusted to transmit to my children, to meet it. Now I am quite willing to submit to the 'spoiling of my goods' if need be, but with you I believe that there are many in England who do not wish it. For my own part, I do not think committees needful, but I have no objection to them if others think differently."

On July 13th the Bishop reached home. "As I travelled the length and breadth of the fair land of Natal, I know not whether disappointment or hope predominated," he wrote. "I could not but feel disappointment as I saw how great opportunities had been thrown away, and lost for ever. It is in everybody's mouth that no Bishop ever had a fairer field before him. Ten years ago little needed to be done to supply the scanty European population with means of grace. Gradually, by a little exertion, each district might have been supplied as its wants arose. The other religious bodies had exhibited no great activity, and were not in high repute. It is commonly said that the bulk of the people welcomed the appointment of a Bishop, and were prepared to accept the Church for their teacher. The Mother Church itself supplied ample means. Many thousand pounds were placed at the disposal of the Bishop. What has been the issue? what the fruits? These

—Wesleyanism has done the work the Church has left undone; has drawn into its ranks very many of our neglected people; confidence has been utterly destroyed; large sums of money have been frittered away and wasted upon plans which have come to nothing. There has been no labouring in season and out of season among the people; and the only valuable fruits of ten years' Episcopate—the Kafir translations—are not at all generally accepted, and are being supplanted by others. It was impossible to ride through the country as I have done, and look upon its spiritual condition, without deep distress. . . . And yet there is hope at least for a large part of the country. The fact that in ten places subscriptions have been eagerly entered into to support Clergymen, shows how much may yet be done. Were there but an earnest and faithful chief Pastor, the number of the Clergy would speedily be doubled." After going on to speak of the need for more attention to education and to Mission work, the Bishop says: "Unless a sound, earnest, laborious Bishop be speedily appointed to this Diocese, the Church must, humanly speaking, die out. It is impossible, even were my own energies not nearly worn out, that the Diocese should be worked up and its life restored by a Bishop resident in Cape Town. Nor, though an Edinburgh Reviewer is pleased to think that I have nothing to do, can one Bishop adequately discharge the duties of two Dioceses."

The English mail, which met the Bishop on his arrival at home, brought tidings of the death of his brother, the Rev. Henry Gray. He wrote at once to his brother and sister, Mr. Edward Gray and Mrs. Williamson, as follows :—

"Bishop's Court, July 19th, 1864.

"My dear Edward—So another dear brother is gone to his rest. I suppose we all felt that he could not last long under these repeated attacks. Another link has been broken. May we all be ready when our Lord calls us. I mourn for poor dear Emily, who has been a most loving and devoted wife. It is a marvel to me that, with the life I had led these seventeen years, I should have outlasted him! . . . We returned home on

Wednesday, and, thank God, found all well and happy, and are greatly enjoying the quiet and comfort of our beautiful home, though immersed in the work of two English mails and public correspondence *in re* Colenso. . . . I do not know whether indignation or distress was uppermost in my mind as I rode through Natal. . . . There must be another Bishop soon. . . . If I do not consecrate another, should Colenso go there, the Church in Natal would die out. Some would cling to the State Bishop, some become nothing; all earnest religious people would join the sects. . . . I think the Church feels itself strengthened by my visit; more united, too, and more determined to present a bold front against the apostate and the world. But there will be troubles, probably a schism, if the Privy Council denies this Church its liberties. We hope ever to look to our Lord and His Will for guidance—not to the world with its Courts;—and that Will clearly is that His Church should be preserved from false apostles. I have engaged four more men in Natal, but I want immediately six more Clergy. If they were at once forthcoming, I should feel much relieved about the future. Bishop Tozer is with us. He sails for Zanzibar on Friday, to establish his Mission there. Sophy will have given you an account of ourselves and our journey more full and graphic than I can do. She has been more gallant than ever through this journey. Her 700 mile ride seemed as nothing to her; but you know how patient and enduring she is, and how she makes the best of everything. Our Colonial Secretary, Rawson, goes home this mail, as Governor of the Bahamas. We are very sorry to lose him and his wife; they are very good people. I think our journey cost £250. . . . Charlie will, I trust, be ordained by S. Oxon at Christmas. I think his views and mind are deepening."

By the same mail the Bishop wrote to his son an account of the Visitation, going on as he so often did, to him especially, to matters of a more interior and restful character: "With regard to ——, contempt for parental authority prepared the mind for a contempt for all authority. Our Lord was pleased oftenest

to set before His disciples His Humanity (which has been as often denied as His Divinity), calling Himself the Son of Man. Among other reasons for this was their inability to receive the truth concerning Him and His Fulness. 'I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now.' At times, and gradually as His Ministry passed on, He led them on to see and receive the whole truth. As when He told S. Peter that flesh and blood had not revealed, etc.; and replied to Philip, He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father, and declared that He and the Father were One.

"I have often marvelled that people should talk of the difference between S. Paul and S. James. They write from different points of view to meet opposite errors. I receive the teaching of both, and they harmonise with the convictions of my own mind. . . . I trust that as the period for ordination draws on, your inner life is deepening, and that you are weighing what the responsibilities you are about to undertake will bind you to. There is a great deal in Bridge's *Christian Ministry* (a Low Church book) which I found useful. But prayer and thoughtfulness will be your best preparation."

There was a lull now in the great struggle, during which Bishop Gray was thoughtfully and prayerfully making ready to strive for the Faith, come what might. He writes—

To the Rev. Dr. WILLIAMSON.

"Bishop's Court, August 17th, 1864.

"My dear Richard—Wishing to be prepared for whatever may happen, I am anxious that you, as my commissary, should be the receptacle for any recommendations of men to fight the Church's and her Lord's battle against the world and infidelity, if we should be driven out here to consecrate a Bishop. Will you please be so, and look out yourself for a true and good man? We have nothing to offer, though I have no fears about money. . . . A calm, well-judging, devoted, and firm man, and withal a scholar. . . . Of course, I have no power over Privy Councils, but I have a duty to perform to my Lord and to His Church; and if I can provide a faithful Bishop for this portion

of the flock, I will, let the Courts of the world say and do what they will. Help me to find a man, therefore. Let him come out in faith, looking up to God. I have no fear what the result will be. Of course, if the Privy Council judge uprightly, I leave the matter in the hands of the Archbishop. . . . Bishop Tozer and Dr. Steere have sailed for Zanzibar. Everything is in a very depressed state here, our people migrating to New Zealand."

To the Same.

"Bishop's Court, September 16th, 1864.

. . . "I think it very possible I may have to sail for England by the February mail. The conduct of S. P. G. will, I fear, drive me to this, even if I have not to go and look out for a Bishop. . . . They reduce their grant made to Colenso by one-third . . . and do not undertake to look for or send out any Clergy! I have met with no discouragement like this since the struggle began, and feel it not a little hard to be thrown thus by this professedly Church Society. Hawkins excuses their conduct on the ground of —— on the Standing Committee, and the presence of others with 'ecclesiastical crotchets.' Bullock would, I am sure, in his private capacity, examine men and send them out if we can find and pay them. Every day is of importance. . . . I have no fault to find with what the Judges did in Privy Council. They were very careful not to claim jurisdiction. I had the shorthand notes. The Lord Chancellor alone stood on tender ground. I daresay that he will do what he can against the Church."

To Edward Gray, Esq.

"September 16th, 1864.

. . . "The papers did not give a correct report of P. C. proceedings. The shorthand was different. They did not deny my jurisdiction, but said they must guard against claiming any themselves. I confess that I believe the lawyers will find some loophole for deciding against the Church and the Faith. I am sending a protest to S. Oxon and Phillimore for

revision, to be put in under certain circumstances. I am not sure that even that is not an *appearance*."

To the Rev. JOHN KEBLE, Hursley.

"Bishop's Court, September 17th, 1864.

"My dear Mr. Keble—I am very glad that you and Dr. Pusey are likely to publish on the subject of the Court of Appeal. The Church of England is in a thoroughly false position, and, unless she destroys her Court, it will destroy her. The whole subject of the Supremacy wants a thorough discussion. I dread men sinking down into a passive condition, as they did after the Gorham Judgment. Every such act as that of the Convocation or Declaration should give courage to grapple with this fearful evil of the Privy Council. It must be remembered, after all, that men whose writings the Church declares to be heretical are witnessing in her name against Christ among our people. She must insist upon having the power to remedy so great a wrong. Instead of being established, she is persecuted, and her Lord is wounded. I have not seen J. H. N.'s *Apologia*, but have ordered it. I have urged the Central African Committee to support Bishop Tozer in his present attempt to penetrate into Africa from Zanzibar. . . . Bishop Tozer is a most energetic, single-minded, and devoted man. In some things I have differed from him, but I am sure he will not spare himself. I should not be surprised if Zanzibar itself with its Mahometan population attracted much of his attention. . . . After S. P. G.'s failure . . . I believe I shall be compelled to go home after my next Synod, and make a personal appeal in England, in order that I may not fail in my engagements, but I ought not (if it can be helped) to leave Africa at the present time; and as I grow older, I shrink from the toil, and the cost of these visits is very great. I shall, however, hold myself in readiness. In two days I start on another ride with my wife of 500 miles up our western coast."

This letter crossed one from Mr. Keble himself.

"Hursley, September 5th, 1864.

"My dear Lord—I have been waiting in the hope of having something more to write to you, and now have scarce time to write at all. Our last event, so far as I know, is Pusey's pamphlet, which I suppose you will receive by this mail. It is hardly time for it to have struck out many sparks either of opposition or of sympathy. He seems disappointed at people's apathy. I wrote somewhat intending to back him up, but it seemed to him and others imprudent, so it waits for correction. But I had better say at once the only thing which makes me fancy it worth while to write to you now. One sentence in your kind letter of July 15th (for which I was very thankful) startled me exceedingly. I had not heard the facts before—'The Law Officers have advised the Crown to refer to the Judicial Committee questions which could not come before it by the ordinary process of the law, as regards the Colenso affair.' I ventured in a sort of horror to ask Sir W. Heathcote about it, and I fancy I may as well send you his remark:—'If the fact is as the Bishop states, I should think that it was a step on the part of the Law Officers wholly unprecedented, and I cannot help thinking that the word '*advised*' must be used equivocally. If, indeed, the Law Officers have really '*advised*' (in the sense of recommended as expedient) any particular course, when others are at least equally eligible in point of law, it would seem that they have erred, not only in advising wrongly, if so it be, but in advising at all. But if they have advised only in the sense which is the ordinary one when the subject matter is law, *i.e.* have given *their opinion* that certain matters *are* within the Province of the Privy Council, then the Bishop is begging the question when he says that the advice is wrong.'

"I do not know, but I suppose that Sir W. had regard to the *immense* powers given to that Committee in the wording of the Act of Parliament (unless I misunderstand it) 3 and 4 William IV. s. 41, 73—'All complaints in the nature of appeals which, either by virtue of the act, or of any law, statute, or custom, may be brought before his Majesty from the sen-

tence of any court, *Judge or Judicial Officer* . . . shall be referred by his Majesty to the said Judicial Committee,' etc.; and vii. 4—'It shall be lawful for his Majesty to refer to the said Judicial Committee, for hearing or consideration, any such other matters whatever as his Majesty shall think fit, and such Committee shall thereupon hear and consider the same, and shall advise his Majesty thereon in manner aforesaid.' Heathcote himself seemed a little startled when I read those clauses to him. They *seem* to warrant almost any application of the Court's power. I asked him whether the Queen's Bench or other courts might grant a prohibition in case of excess of jurisdiction, as they can to the lower Ecclesiastical Courts. He did not know. Perhaps this may be worth considering. It would not be right (would it?) if we could anyhow raise the funds, to let judgment go by default in such a question as this, and to apply for a prohibition would be the contrary to acknowledging their jurisdiction. When you have applied and are refused, then will be the moment for considering how far we can go on acknowledging the supremacy. I cannot but think that we should raise the funds for such a purpose, if we go prudently to work; but I may say to you that the folks here are very jealous of one's saying beforehand that one would not obey such and such a law. One must, I dare say, sometimes do so, but it may make a great difference in the result how a person orders himself in so doing. People are very touchy about 'defiance,' and I suppose it is charitable to give them as little excuse as possible for holding off from us. All this you know far better than I, and I am ashamed to have gone on prosing about it; but you will excuse me, and believe me always most faithfully yours, JOHN KEBLE."

From the BISHOP OF OXFORD.

"North Wales, September 3rd, 1864.

"My very dear brother—I have been in continual correspondence with our good patriarch on your matters. But he is altogether of opinion that whilst you, as being cast off by the State as an established Church, are free to act as you are doing

for the Faith of our Dear Lord; that we, as still established by law, are not free to assume the settlement of a matter which has been appealed to the Queen. I have talked the matter over with Gladstone, and he thinks the Archbishop right in this. There is not the least shrinking back from you in the Archbishop's view, but a simple desire to act aright in the high post in which God has placed him, and of course his decision must bind us. I cannot but hope that the coming decision will leave us free to act, and, when we are, you need not doubt how we shall act. The ex-Bishop is doing all he can to make his place good. He is going to the British Association, at which I had promised to attend, but I have written to decline going, and told my intended host that I could not voluntarily expose myself to meeting Colenso under his present circumstances. . . . I really cannot tell you how thankful I feel that you have been enabled thus to stand in the gap. Your course seems to me perfectly unassailable. I was talking to Keble about it a little while ago, and especially about your charge: he said—"It is wonderful; it is like a piece out of the fourth century! It is really noble." May God in His Mercy uphold, direct, and comfort you to the very end of all. I shall feel very happy if I am able to ordain at Christmas your son and mine together. Oh, may they set out aright, and hold on till they meet with joy before the Great Bishop. Adieu for to-night, dear and honoured brother.—I am, your faithful S. Oxon."

"Pall Mall, October 5th, 1864.

"My dearest Bishop—I thank you from my heart for your noble conduct in setting us free from this terrible reproach. Come what will, I say so; and so far as I can see at present, I think you are quite right in all your future plans. Phillimore and R. Palmer both think your every past step safe, and such as will hold against the shock if it be assailed. God grant it. On Monday next Lushington's Judgment in the Essays and Reviews is to be reversed by the Privy Council Committee, evidently packed for the purpose, no one who ever sat on such questions having been put upon it. S. Oxon."

On his return from the 500 mile ride above mentioned the Bishop writes as follows, October 18th, 1864 :—

To the Rev. Dr. WILLIAMSON.

. . . "We have just returned from our ride up the west coast, and I have been writing almost ever since without ceasing, so that eyes are aching and arm stiff. I found our work in a healthy state everywhere, except at my Mission Station; and, in spite of want of means, I have committed myself to several fresh works. . . . In Belson's parish alone I confirmed 112 persons, of whom full 105 were converts from heathenism. . . . I hope that no further delay took place in publishing my appeal. Promptness in all these cases is of vast importance. Men for Natal are wanted even more than money. . . . We have before us for next month a gathering of choirs in the Cathedral, a Conference of Clergy here, and a meeting of schoolmasters; then an ordination, then the Synod. I hope to get a little quiet in the intervals. I have just got children from two tribes in Natal to my college, and we are now, with lads from the Zambesi, quite full.

"I have most hearty and affectionate letters from very many, from the Archbishop downwards, approving of and thanking me for what I have done. . . . I shall not leave Africa if I can help it; but if P. C. go against the Church and the faith, or my appeals for help fail, I shall hold myself in readiness to sail in February."

To EDWARD GRAY, Esq.

"October 18th, 1864.

. . . "Phillimore wrote me word that I was not expected to do anything with regard to Colenso's petition, and all I have done is to send S. Oxon a provisional protest, should jurisdiction be claimed for the Crown. I get most hearty and encouraging letters from the Archbishop, S. Oxon, Keble, Wordsworth, Neale, and others. It cheers me very much that the course I have adopted, and the Charge I have delivered, is approved by such men. May God give me grace to act wisely, faithfully,

humbly, at each stage of these proceedings. I cannot rid myself of my responsibilities as you desire, and throw them upon the Archbishop. The burden of the contest is at present laid upon me, and I must bear it alone. It would be to act cowardly and unfaithfully were I to back out and tell the Archbishop that he must stand in the breach; and I could not do so if I would. I dread nothing so much as the actual personal collision in Natal, should I be called to consecrate there, in the face of the opposition of the whole power of the State. I fear that, as all Asia was turned from S. Paul, so all Africa might be from me, and yet I may have to brave it. It is the excitement of these things, however, and the fear of making mistakes, that slays me. But sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof. Colenso's *Remarks* have been sent out here for gratuitous distribution—they are full of fallacies and falsehoods. I have scarce had time to read his pamphlet through. I must not let the matter sink to a mere controversy, but I ought to set some matters right. . . . I have given the Archbishop my views most fully and plainly, perhaps too much so."

To Charles Norris Gray, Esq.

"October 16th, 1864.

"My dearest boy—I think it is right that you should know that I possibly may be compelled to go to England by the February mail. If the Privy Council should advise the Queen that she can or ought to hear Colenso's Appeal, I should probably go. If they threw him over, and left the Archbishop free to appoint another Bishop, I should pretty certainly not go. In case of an unfavourable decision, I should have to make my appeal for funds, find a Bishop, make good my own position with the Church at home. You will be able to decide for yourself as to my course, probably, by the line taken by the Privy Council. . . . I do not know what your own views would be about a sphere of labour, but I believe it would be the greatest benefit to you who hardly know what a parish Priest's work is, or its duties, obligations, etc., to begin in a thoroughly worked parish, under a first-rate man. I believe

that your standard of ministerial duty through life may depend very much upon the circumstances under which you begin your ministry. I have the greatest dread and horror of the kind of half-hearted ministry to which I think many young men of the present day seem inclined, getting as much amusement as they can consistently with such a discharge of duty as satisfies the requirements of the world. The present Oxford Essay School is responsible for a great deal of this; it can never create an earnest ministry like that which the movement of 1833, with all its faults, has done.

"I know of no parish more efficiently worked than Kidderminster. If it continues what it was, it is an admirable school for Curates. If you took a Curacy I should like you to go there, but Claughton may be full. If not Kidderminster, would you like the idea of Newbury, under Archdeacon Randall's son? If in doubt, you can at any time consult the Bishop of Oxford. . . . Archdeacon Bickersteth would be an admirable man to be under, or to consult. I attach the greatest importance to the seeing how a parish is worked. You would get there as many new ideas as you have got at Cuddesden.

"You will have seen Colenso's pamphlet, probably, full of the grossest misstatements. I have been in doubt whether to answer it or not."

The following letter is one which must come home with a warm glow to the heart of every Christian Priest.

To the Rev. CHARLES NORRIS GRAY.

"Bishop's Court, November 10th, 1864.

"My dearest boy—By the time this reaches you, you will, I trust, have become a Minister of Christ. From henceforth you devote yourself, soul and body, all you have and all you are, to Him and to His service. He is to be Master, you servant. For His Sake, out of love to Him, you are to strive with all your might to spread His Truth and His Kingdom, and win His redeemed to Him. You pledge yourself to sacrifice tastes, wishes, inclinations, prospects, all that the world has to offer, to Him; count them all as dung, if you may win Him, and be

found in *that* day in Him. It is a blessed service. I would not, with all its anxieties, distresses, reproaches—and I have had my share of these—exchange it for *any* the world has to offer. Henceforth, dearest boy, you will be a fellow-labourer with your father; it may be in far-distant lands, in the Lord's vineyard. May He give you grace to fight a good fight, and of His Goodness to win a Crown. Be true and faithful; hold to the Faith once for all delivered. Witness for Christ, and you shall have a cross to bear, but He Whom you serve will support and strengthen and comfort you under its burden. I have a good hope that you will prove true, for I have seen a gradual growth which I trust will not be checked; but go on till you reach to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ. You are as yet but on the threshold of the spiritual life, and have much to learn, as your excellent friend Mr. King, who has written me a comforting letter about you, will tell you. May the life of God within your soul be deepened hour by hour. I lean, myself, if I should have to go home, to your continuing a little longer at Cuddesden, and helping Mr. King, if you may, in the parish, while you continue your studies. But choose for yourself. If all goes right, and the way is open for the Archbishop to consecrate, I shall not move. If there should be further proceedings before Civil Courts, I should probably leave at once. The Bishop of Oxford would be able to tell you, probably, whether there would be any necessity for me to leave. My object is to get a Bishop, and to consecrate myself if others cannot. If that point is safe I care for but little else. I have written a reply to Colenso's Remarks for my own satisfaction, but I shall probably not publish. Others cannot, for it consists almost wholly of corrections of gross misstatements of facts, of which the evidence is in my possession only. . . . I have at length read both your sermon and essays. The sermon is raw and youthful: I can quite believe you felt what you wrote. It is the feeling (not excitement) that gives power to preaching. Let us realise all we say, and the importance of it, and others will be impressed. The difficulty is to live as we preach. . . . Ever, dearest boy, your affectionate Father,

"R. CAPETOWN."

To the Rev. Dr. WILLIAMSON.

"November 11th, 1864.

. . . "The talk of separation from the Church is a mere device of the enemy. I am surprised that any should be weak enough to be taken in. We are one with the Church. We never were in connection with the State, and have not ever separated from it; but we are not (as a Church) one with it. With all that attaches to the Church of England, as an accident of her position as the Established Church of England, we have nothing to do. Colenso and his friends would force us under the iron despotism of the State, which bids fair to destroy the faith of the Church of England. God helping, we will not be brought under this. I do not 'cast the Church off;' with all my soul I would the State! The Church of England is in a false position. I will not, if I can help it, allow the State's claims to be coiled round the necks of Colonial Churches. . . . We have had our Festival of Choirs, which went off very well, and this week a Conference of Clergy to consider the question of Mahometanism. The Sultan is going to build a great mosque in Cape Town. I nearly lost Badnall. The Graham's Town folks petitioned the Bishop to make him Dean, but he decided not to go."

To the Same.

"December 20th, 1864.

. . . "I am as anxious as any that the great questions at issue should not sink down to a personal controversy between Colenso and myself, which he strives with all his might to reduce it to. I have therefore refrained from publishing any reply to his numerous charges. On Sunday I ordained five men, one for Natal. . . . I have prepared my Charge and address. My Visitation is January 17th, and we open Synod the same day. Colenso's pamphlets, circulated largely and gratuitously here, have had some little effect in disturbing minds, but it will force people to consider questions. I enter into all organic questions which have been most discussed, and endeavour to lay down the true platform for unestablished

Colonial Churches. Nothing very new. The Privy Council judgment may come out on the very day on which I charge: rather UNfortunate if we be found to differ! My thoughts and prayers have been much with dear Charlie during the past week. I trust that he may grow up to be a true witness for Christ and the Faith, at a time of much falling away. . . . Sophy has been weak, but what a mercy it is that she can go on with one work after another, every day from morning to night!"

To Mrs. MOWBRAY.

"December 20th, 1864.

. . . "I am considerably advanced in my preparations for my approaching Synod, where we shall have little to do save to discuss principles arising out of the troubles of the present times. My Charge will be chiefly taken up with these questions. Your man is likely to have a more stirring session, I suppose, than the last. What does he think of the rising power of Gladstone? I sincerely hope that the University will keep him, in spite of my many disagreements with him. *I* have not lost confidence in him yet. We have had an emigration to the States going on here; 900 men were enrolled or rather enlisted. I believe that there is sufficient evidence to enable the Governor to suppress it. There has also been a great emigration to New Zealand, which has weakened the Church a good deal in the country districts. Men seem to shrink from this as a doomed land, and certainly it is an afflicted one.

"We are now in the midst of poor feasts, Christmas trees, tea-drinking for 300 children, choir dinner, servants' pic-nics. . . . . It is pleasant to hear good accounts of all your children. . . . . I am sure that Charlie will look back upon his year at Cuddesden as a very blessed one in after life. It has given him just what he needed."

It was on December 21st that the Bishop's son, here alluded to, was ordained at Cuddesden, by perhaps the most dearly loved of his friends, Bishop Wilberforce. He was at the time overwhelmed with work, but found time to write a

few loving words in Ember week: "You are, I need scarce say, a great deal in my thoughts this week, and in my prayers too. May God, of His Great Goodness, give you largely of His Holy Spirit, and make you a true and faithful witness and minister of Jesus Christ. I have myself five candidates whom I hope to ordain."

By this same mail (though dated a few days earlier) the Bishop wrote to Mr. Keble, asking counsel, which had in part been anticipated by his venerable friend at Hursley, and was already on its way. The two letters are subjoined:—

"Bishop's Court, December 14th, 1864.

"My dear Mr. Keble—My brother writes me word that you have been kind enough to send me another offering. Very many thanks for the same. I have quoted Hooker more than once in my judgment. His words have thus, in a double way, helped to vindicate, in our African Church, faith and discipline. My brother adds that you are kind enough to send me a copy of your edition. Of course we have it, and in the library, for which we are so largely indebted to you, but this copy shall have its due place of honour. This Colenso case shows the importance of good theological libraries in the Colonies.

"My mind is running forward a good deal to the future. I am continually pondering what our duty may be if Colenso should get a verdict in a Civil Court in his favour, and on the strength of it resume his Episcopal office. I have no doubt about excommunication. But am I to urge the Diocese to elect another Bishop? and my Comprovincials to consecrate? Hitherto the Crown has nominated to all Colonial Sees, and usually the Archbishop has consecrated or recommended to the Crown. The Civil Law would prevent both the Archbishop and Secretary for the Colonies from taking any step in the teeth of the decisions of a Civil Court. But is the Church here to acquiesce? How far may we fairly disregard the letters patent, and the claims of the Crown which they imply? What are the real rights of the Crown in such a matter? or has it any? How far are

we committed to the acknowledgment of its rights by our reception of letters patent? My own impression is that the Crown has no real right in the matter, and that we ought not to allow a deposed heretic, under its authority, to witness against Christ and mislead the flock. That duty to our Lord requires, that if the Church at home will not send out a true and faithful pastor, we should choose and consecrate one here. Am I right? Will you advise me in this matter?

"I am much struck with the reverent way in which our very flippant press has treated the whole case. Usually it writes presumptuously on all religious subjects: now scribblers seem restrained by awe—the subject is above them. With many grateful thanks, believe me, dear Mr. Keble, faithfully yours, R. CAPETOWN."

Before this letter was written the saintly man to whom it was addressed had been struck with palsy. It was on the night of S. Andrew's Day (November 30th, 1864), that while writing, Mr. Keble lost power in the left side and right arm, but without losing consciousness or presence of mind. His writing became illegible, and his voice indistinct, and though the most alarming symptoms were relieved by the next day, he never entirely recovered his former strength. It is very touching to find a letter dictated by himself, and written by Mrs. Keble, to his beloved African Bishop only four days after this serious attack.

"Hursley, December 4th, 1864.

"My dear Lord—I am sorry to tell you that my husband is just at present disabled from writing with his own hand, but he is very anxious that you should be quite at ease about the £1,000, which he hopes to give an order for by the first week in January at latest. He desires me to add that he most earnestly hopes there may be no necessity for your coming to England in February." (Here the dictated part of the letter begins.) "'What turn the Colenso case may take before the Privy Council we have no means of judging. You will see by the inclosed paper what we are trying to do, as to the *Essay*

and Review grievance: there has been delay through an endeavour to secure the co-operation of the Low Churchmen, but they are naturally afraid of damaging the Gorham Judgment, and so hang back for the present. But you will see by the papers that Disraeli has spoken favourably, and we have reason to be sure of the Archbishop of Canterbury and Mr. Gladstone's sympathy, although of course they do not pledge themselves—nor indeed does our association itself—to the especial form of remedy which this paper indicates. I think there is a fair chance of success, but I am quite prepared to fail this year or next year, and indeed for an indefinite time, provided only we can keep up a strong and real movement for redress; for I consider that this evil sadly touches the *well*-being, but leaves untouched the *being* of the Church. That it is, in fact, but one more instance of the decay and neglect of godly discipline, over which the Church, in all its branches, has had so long to mourn.

"'That it is a sin, but not yet, so long as it is really resisted, a deadly sin;—and therefore it is no justification for breaking communion with a Church which endures it. That there is a real and strong resistance is clear, were it only from the proceedings in Convocation on the subject. Should anything else of the same kind occur, for instance in the Colenso case, I suppose that the same principle ought to be applied; and that we should be quite sure of the real participation of the Church as a Church in the schism or heresy before disowning communion with it. And here again I should say that we ought to make large allowance of time for so great and manifold a body as the Church of England to make up and manifest its real mind in. Supposing, *e.g.*, that your Lordship were compelled to excommunicate Dr. Colenso, I presume that very ample time of warning must be allowed before extending the same sentence to others, who, with more or less excuse, might be tempted to disregard it;—and again, that one would proceed in the way of *suspension* at first, and that, if need be, renewed ever so often, if by any means one might avoid the *ultima ratio*. Such a course, carried out in the same calm and religious

tone as all men acknowledged in the Acts of your late Synod at Cape Town, would, I feel sure, by the Blessing of God, do great things for us here, perhaps make all the difference in the conflict which seems to be coming on. You know all this much better than I do, but I know you will excuse my saying what came into my mind.

"'I think I ought to say that the Low Churchmen, as far as I can see, are not wanting in indignation at what the Privy Council has done, but for the reason I have mentioned would wish the remedy to come rather by enlarging the powers of Convocation (to which they would add a large element) than by altering the Court of Appeal. Their plan might be feasible, and perhaps in some ways desirable (?), but it would take a very long time, and bring no redress to the immediate evil.

"'Pray believe me, my dear Lord, that we are thinking and praying for you more than you can perhaps well imagine,—as I dare say you are for us. This day week seems fearfully near, and one feels as if it were drawing things to a point. He will help us,—may we only not prove unworthy.' You will see, my dear Lord, that I have been writing down exactly my husband's own words. He is not allowed to read, any more than to write,[1] just at present, but I am thankful to say he is mending daily. We are to leave home next week for Torquay.—Believe me, my dear Lord, yours very respectfully,

"CHARLOTTE KEBLE."

Mr. Keble's allusion to "things drawing to a point" was because on the 14th of December Dr. Colenso's appeal was to come on before the Judicial Committee. Sir Hugh Cairns (now Lord Cairns) and the Queen's Advocate appeared for the Metro-

[1] "But he can scarcely help *thinking*," as Mrs. Keble wrote to Sir J. T. Coleridge, who adds: "This was the time when the issue between the Bishop of Cape Town and Colenso was submitted to the Judicial Committee, and he looked on that submission in the first instance, on the part of the Government, and the question being entertained by the Committee at all, as grievances. . . . I mention the matter, because there is no doubt that the general subject formed to the end of his life one of the sources of distress which helped to break down his strength, and accelerated its close."—*Life*, p. 503.

politan. The case submitted for the latter said that he appeared "under protest, denying with all due reverence that her Majesty in Council has any jurisdiction in the subject matter of the said petition, or that any appeal lies from what he has done in the matter of the said complainant, either to her Majesty or to the Judicial Committee of her most honourable Privy Council." The four reasons (already so often stated [1]) why the appeal should not be allowed were put forth, and the case concluded with the prayer that "their Lordships would be pleased to advise her Majesty to pronounce for the protest of the said Dr. Gray, and against the said pretended complaint and appeal.

ROBERT PHILLIMORE.
"H. M. CAIRNS.
"EDWARD BADELEY."

Mr. James, Q.C., opened with a sharp attack on the Bishop of Cape Town, and the Lord Chancellor "thought it desirable that the learned gentleman should confine himself to the question of jurisdiction," and accordingly the discussion was confined to that preliminary point. The case was argued, according to the judgment of the press, "with a dignity and propriety on the part of the Bishop of Cape Town's counsel, which contrasted strongly with the personal attacks, little less than scurrilous, to which Bishop Colenso's leading counsel thought fit to descend." The argument was continued on December

[1] "I. Because he, the said Rev. Dr. Gray, as Bishop of the See of Cape Town and Metropolitan Bishop, as aforesaid, possesses full right and title to exercise the powers and authority . . . upon and over the Suffragan Bishops . . . and upon and over the Bishop of Natal as one of them. . . .

"II. Because the petitioner received his Bishopric, and was appointed and consecrated thereto, upon the faith of his subjection and submission to the said power and authority . . . etc. etc.

"III. Because the said Metropolitan was not only fully entitled, but also solemnly bound, to receive and examine, to adjudicate and determine . . . the charges preferred . . . and the said judgment and sentence were duly pronounced and promulgated according to the duty, right, power, and authority of the said Metropolitan, etc. . . .

"IV. Because, looking at the said letters patent as constituting a contract, . . . any appeal would lie to the Archbishop of Canterbury," etc. etc.

19th. The *Guardian* of that week remarked that Dr. Colenso's advocates seemed "content if on any ground they could extract a decision unfavourable to the Bishop of Cape Town's authority, —we had almost said, if they can excite a feeling destructive of the Bishop of Cape Town's good name. Accordingly they rely on pleas irreconcilable with one another, and advance arguments alternately confirmatory, alternately subversive of their case. One of them maintains that the Bishop of Natal is a Suffragan of Cape Town, just as the Bishop of London is of Canterbury; another denies that Cape Town can legally claim any jurisdiction over the Bishop of Natal at all. At one point we meet with the extraordinary doctrine that the Crown possesses an immediate visitatorial power over the Colonial Churches; at another we are told that a Bishop is a servant of the Crown, in a position analogous to that of a Civil Governor, if not absolutely holding office at will. Now it is argued that a Colonial Bishop is irremovable until his patent is revoked; now again that the patent itself was *ultra vires*, and incapable of conveying the coercive authority it professed to confer."

Meanwhile the Visitation Charge, to which the Bishop of Cape Town had alluded in several letters, was delivered. It seems impossible to condense or make extracts from a document, every word of which is so important and so interesting, but the charge itself will be found in the volume of charges, etc., which it is hoped will speedily follow the publication of the Bishop's life.

It was not with Bishop Gray's own sanction that he appeared as a respondent, even under protest, in this case, as the following letter will show:—

To Edward Gray, Esq.

"Bishop's Court, January 16th, 1865.

"My dear Edward—I do indeed very deeply regret the course adopted with regard to Colenso's appeal, as you will see by the accompanying note, which I now write in haste that I may not be taunted with having done nothing after a verdict given against me, but which I do not wish you to publish till

you hear from me again. My only hesitation about disavowal has arisen from my unwillingness to do anything displeasing to my dear kind friend the Bishop of Oxford, who has generously taken responsibility upon himself; but it is so in violation of my own deepest convictions, and so opposed to all that I have said publicly and privately for months past, that I must disavow the act. Look at my position. You tell me plainly that Phillimore does not agree with me. If he does not, Cairns, I am sure, will not. On the other hand, I am convinced that there is no middle ground between my principles and Colenso's; that my course can only be defended upon my own principles, and that those principles are true. I do not expect that Establishmentarians, and more especially lawyers, will take my view; and I think that their advocacy of my cause, on their principles, is likely to damage it. It makes me far more anxious about the result to know that I am represented by lawyers; for I do not think that they will render any real help, and if jurisdiction is claimed, and I still excommunicate, I shall be told by every one that my protest is a mere form; that by appearing before the Privy Council I acknowledged its jurisdiction, and I shall be in an infinitely worse position than if I stood aloof. One thing I must request, that all further proceedings be stayed. I have never done anything to recognise the jurisdiction of the Privy Council, nor has this Church; and I propose, God helping, to excommunicate Colenso if he comes back with the authority of the Crown to Natal, let the consequences to myself be what they may. I must protest, therefore, against being committed further. I will write to the Bishop of Oxford. The Charge which I shall deliver to-morrow will be in the teeth of the line which I am committed to at home! I know, my dear fellow, that you have done for the best, and I pray God that He will overrule it for good, but at present it appears to add greatly to my difficulties.—Ever affectionately yours,

"R. CAPETOWN."

On the 31st of the same month the Bishop wrote again on the same subject:—

"My dear Edward—I wrote to you, on hearing that I was to appear before the Privy Council, by the overland mail. Our steamer did not reach Mauritius in time to catch it, and consequently you will not receive it until after this. I now send a letter addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury, which, if a judgment should be given by P. C. claiming jurisdiction, or denying mine, I must request you to send to him, and ask his Grace's permission to publish. If the judgment should be favourable I am willing that it should be altogether suppressed, for I do not wish to seem to cast blame on those dear and kind friends who have taken responsibility upon themselves at an important crisis, and thought that they acted for the best, and perhaps did. The letter will speak for itself, so I need not say another word upon that subject. I should like to know why Lord Chelmsford, Lord Wensleydale, and Sir J. Coleridge, who sat at first, did not sit during the trial, and why Dr. Lushington and the Master of the Rolls were substituted for them."

To the Bishop of Oxford.

"Bishop's Court, January 16th, 1865.

"My dear Bishop—I need not say that I ought to feel thankful to you for not shirking from taking responsibility upon yourself at an anxious and critical time, when you think that by so doing you may serve me or the Church. But if I had been in England I would not have consented to appear by counsel, because I am persuaded that the act of pleading before the Court, let my protest be ever so loud, will be regarded as a recognition of its jurisdiction, or at least of its right to decide whether it has jurisdiction or not, and will hereafter, should it claim such, be quoted against me. The world will say, As long as you thought there was a chance of getting a verdict in your favour you acknowledged the Court—you only repudiate its authority when it decides against you. The appearance put in for me will, if the judgment is against me, greatly hamper my future proceedings. May God overrule the decision of the Council, and save me from the great trial to which an adverse

judgment will expose me. . . . Happen what may, I will not appear before the Council to plead the merits of this case."

Enclosed was the following letter to the Archbishop:—

"Bishop's Court, January 31st, 1865.

"My dear Lord—The last mail brought me word that I was to appear by counsel, and under protest, before the Judicial Committee of Privy Council, in the matter of Dr. Colenso's petition to the Crown. I had myself been unwilling to put in an appearance on the following grounds:—

"I. Because while admitting, I need scarce say, that that court is the highest Civil Court for this Colony, '*quoad temporalia*,' and is the final Court of Appeal for us in civil causes, I could not regard it as having any jurisdiction or authority over the Church here, '*quoad spiritualia*,' and I thought that by arguing before it the question of its jurisdiction, and by pleading my own jurisdiction or authority, I should, notwithstanding my protest, really acknowledge the authority of that Court in spiritual things.

"II. Because I did not think that counsel really could, before such a tribunal, defend the course which I had pursued, and argue my right to try, and if need be depose, a Suffragan, altogether on the grounds upon which I myself rested the right and the duty to do so. I felt that their position would compel them to restrict their arguments to questions of positive law, the relation in which this Church stands to English law and precedent, the force and value of the Queen's letters patent. Whereas, throughout these painful proceedings, while striving to keep as near as possible to English law and precedent, I have never lost sight of the fact that, if my letters patent conveyed absolutely no authority to me, I nevertheless accepted the office of Metropolitan by express mission and commission of the Church at home (as represented by the voice of her Bishops assembled for the consideration of this question), and am as much bound and entitled to exercise the office, in accordance with the Canons, as a Wesleyan Superintendent is entitled to exercise the office delegated to him by his Society.

"I doubted whether this view of the case, which so intimately concerns the religious liberties of the Church in the Colonies, could or would be put forward by counsel before this particular tribunal.

"For the above reasons I instructed my dear brother, who acts for me, not to put in an appearance; and it seems to me important that I should embrace this my first opportunity of placing it upon record that the appearance which has been put in for me is contrary to my instructions. I am deeply sensible that all has been done for the best, and am grateful to all who take trouble, or incur responsibility on my account; but I am compelled to write thus that I may not appear inconsistent or vacillating in your Grace's eyes, or before the Church, should the Judicial Committee unhappily claim jurisdiction, and I, in consequence, be compelled still to pursue the course to which I believe my vows to Christ and to the Church bind me.

"Your Grace, I am sure, agrees with me that this Church could not again hold communion with Dr. Colenso, unless he repented and retracted, without being partakers of his sin.

"Had I consented to appear by counsel, I should have furnished those who appeared for me with information, which without communication with me they could not possess, as to circumstances which have a direct bearing upon points which are sure to be raised in the course of the trial, but which now it is too late to mention.—I have the honour to be, your Grace's obedient servant, R. CAPETOWN."

Meantime the Bishop of Oxford wrote:—

To the LORD BISHOP of CAPE TOWN.

"London, January 9th, 1865.

"My dear Bishop . . . The arguing before the Privy Council, to my mind, has to the fullest degree justified my decision. (*a*) You are entirely uncommitted as to acknowledging its jurisdiction; (*b*) you have had your protest argued most ably; (*c*) you have shown all respect to your Queen, and put your

cause in a far better posture before the people of England. What will be the decision of the P. C. it is impossible to guess. Phillimore is sanguine; I am not. But at all events the questions raised prove that there was the most urgent need for the whole Colonial Church of arguing the matter throughout.

"I venture very strongly to advise you *not* to hurry back, be the issue what it may. Give *us* time at home to see if we can do anything. If *we* fail, *your* time for rousing England will be come . . . All men now feel the exceeding great difficulty of the questions raised, and I think your presence here would have more effect after a while than suddenly upon an adverse judgment. . . . Ever very affectionately yours, S. Oxon.

The Bishop also addressed his Synod, which, before separating, passed seventeen resolutions, among which the first was one expressing the Synod's "sorrow at the great scandal occasioned by the writings of Bishop Colenso, and its deep sympathy with and conviction of the righteousness and justice of the course adopted by their Metropolitan." Among the other resolutions passed in this Synod of January 1865, is one to establish the use of Hymns Ancient and Modern in the Diocese; and another, that, "as a first step to the establishment of a Penitentiary in Cape Town for fallen women, Sisterhoods in England be invited, through the Bishop, to send out Sisters to take charge of such an institution, and that country parishes be invited to co-operate in establishing the Penitentiary."

In a letter (already quoted in part) to Mr. Edward Gray, of January 16th, 1865, the Bishop gives some account of this Synod:—

"We have just finished our Synod. The discussions on the questions of the day have been full and hearty, and the conclusions nearly unanimous. Archdeacon Badnall proposed that we should always vote by orders, to show that the laity had more power than was generally supposed: they unanimously rejected the proposal. They unanimously thanked me for my course in deposing Colenso. They rejected a proposal

of Mr. Foster expressing confidence in the Civil Courts in England, only two voting for it. All but three accepted Archdeacon Badnall's amendment, acquiescing in the decision of the Privy Council judgment, *in re* Long, that we are a purely voluntary association. They unanimously expressed sympathy with the Church of England under the infliction of the Privy Council, and hoped for a speedy alteration in the Court. They rejected the appointment of a Board of ten to manage the finances of the Diocese, of which the Bishop should be President, with one vote, and re-constituted the commission of four laity and three Clergy to advise the Bishop. All but the mover and seconder voted against the Board. The discussions have brought out the fact that Colenso's works have more or less influenced some of the laity out of doors. They do not avow themselves, but it is visible. . . . I thank God for the conclusions of our Synod. They will have their effect on our future. We had to provide luncheon in town every day for sixty, dinner at home each day for twenty-five—thermometer generally 80. Till this judgment reaches us I cannot decide upon my future. I shall not go home if it can possibly be avoided. . . . I feel very worn and weary, and longing for rest; but if need be I hope I shall be prepared to fight this battle unto death. God give me grace to fight it wisely and well. I am just now looking to Colenso's return; my excommunication,—action for damages—probable consequent spoiling of worldly goods. We passed a good number more of, I think, sound resolutions at the Synod. One was to found a Penitentiary. We want a good Sister or two for this." . . .

To the BISHOP of OXFORD.

"Bishop's Court, February 7th, 1865.

"Two things I have above all to guard against—apparent inconsistency in the eye of the Church if I should have to defy the Privy Council, and resting my duty of acting in this matter on the narrow ground of law and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. I need not say with what anxiety I look for the judgment. If

an adverse one, I shall half feel that it is my death-warrant, for I doubt whether, with my shattered nervous system, I could endure the great excitement which the struggle to which I should be committed would entail. But all is in God's Hands; and as I believe that I have a single eye, I trust that He may sustain me. . . . I see that in the argument much stress was laid upon the impropriety of our agreeing in Provincial Synod upon the decision which I ought to give, before it was given openly in Court. The reason for this was, because in Watson's case a great discussion arose as to whether Archbishop Tennison should have condemned in his Provincial Synod, or in Court. Hody's work on this subject I examined at Lambeth. He first was for the Court, and the lawyers went with him. He then wrote laboriously to prove that it should be done in Synod. I wished to make sure of my ground, by condemning both in Court and in Synod. But how absurd to quarrel with what we did! I sat with my assessors: after hearing the case we retired and weighed the evidence alone for several days. We then met together in Synod, in the very assembly where we might most look for God's Presence, and after invoking His Presence, deliberated and concluded what ought to be done. . . Each step was taken by us in the most solemn manner. . . .

"If the judgment should be in favour of Colenso, surely the time will have arrived when the Mother Church should break her silence, and encourage us to maintain the Faith at all hazards. I know how difficult it is for any, but more especially for the Bishops, to move in such a matter, but the Faith manifestly is in danger. . . . Do not think that I am shrinking under the burden laid upon me. I trust that I am prepared to go, if need be, to prison or to death for that which is so distinctly my Lord's Own Cause; but I would wish that no one thing should be left undone to save any portion of the flock from apostasy, and to give strength to His Cause. I think I feel the full weight of the responsibility of my position, and I hope to be preserved from doing anything rashly, but I see no reason to change my view of duty. . . . The whole proceedings seem to force upon us the conviction that the whole position of the Church of Eng-

land, as regards the State, is now, if it has not always been, wrong.

"It is my greatest comfort to know that you, and so many others, pray for me. I distrust myself and my judgment more than some seem to think, but I look hourly for guidance where alone I can hope to find it. What a comfort it would be if I could talk with you and Keble over my perplexities!"

To Edward Gray, Esq.

"Bishop's Court, February 10th, 1865.

"My dear Edward—I had a long talk with Judge Watermeyer yesterday, *in re* my appearance. He seemed to think that my protest saved my position morally and legally. I do not therefore wish you to publish my letter to the Archbishop. . . . I have written by this mail to the Archbishop, S. Oxon, and Keble, to say that if Colenso is upheld by Civil Court, the time will have arrived for the Church to say to us, 'Stand fast in the Faith.' It is of great importance that she should do so. On Colenso's side will be the Crown. A silent Church will be deemed also to be with him. I have nothing to show to the contrary. It is too much to expect that the half-taught laity of a Colony will stand by the Faith and the Church, under the leadership of the Metropolitan alone. Already Colenso has raised the cry (and circulated his pamphlets gratuitously everywhere) that he defends the Crown and the Protestant faith. I am an ambitious pontiff, striving to aggrandise myself. For the poor flock's sake, more than my own, I think that the Bishops and the Church should take their side."

To Dr. Williamson the Bishop wrote in the same language about his appearance before the Privy Council and concerning the Synod. He also says: "Our Synod, thank God, showed no leaning to a truckling policy, nor did our Clergy. We had one very interesting day's conference of the Clergy in my library for the discussion of Missions and spiritual questions. Nothing could be better than the tone. The ten days nearly knocked up the servants and ourselves too. . . . Some mem-

bers of the Synod presented Sophy with a very magnificent pictorial Bible by way of acknowledgment for hospitality shown. The Clergy went back refreshed in body and spirit.... I look out with great anxiety for the next mail, which may bring this important judgment. God guide the Judges aright. If they oppress us, and send Colenso back, there will be a fearful struggle, and who shall say where it will end—what its results will be? I need not tell you that I pray daily, and in the night watches too, to be guided aright in each step I take. I ask for wisdom, patience, faithfulness, meekness, gentleness, humility, perseverance, firmness, courage, decision, determination. All these gifts or graces are much needed by me in my trying position. All the Collects of Epiphany which we have been saying lately are wonderfully suited to my present trials. What words more fitting for us all just now than these?—'O Lord, we beseech Thee mercifully to hear the prayers of Thy people which call upon Thee; and grant that they may both perceive and know what things they ought to do; and also may have grace and power faithfully to fulfil the same, through Jesus Christ our Lord.' To-morrow I preach on Jude 3,[1] in my Cathedral, calling upon my people both to stand by the Faith, and to seek after a deeper insight into it."

To JOHN MOWBRAY, Esq., M.P.

"Bishop's Court, February 25th, 1865.

... "We are waiting calmly for the judgment. I should be very thankful if it should save me from a very painful struggle; but I fear, and am, I trust, prepared for, the worst. A Church that tolerates a Bishop holding and teaching what Colenso does, betrays Christ, and ceases to be a Church. May God preserve us from the temptation to abandon our Lord or His Truth. Jurisdiction or no jurisdiction, we can and must act. ... As to politics, I am still for Gladstone. I should be very sorry to see one who fills the post he does, or the one he will fill, thrown off by the Church, even if my confidence in

[1] "Earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints."

him was not still great. I believe that we owe him a very great deal, and I would still heartily support him. I shall be right glad if the elections should give you a good working majority, but I do not wish to see a weak Conservative ministry. It would be a worse thing for the country than a weak Liberal one." . . .

To the Rev. CHARLES NORRIS GRAY, Kidderminster.

"Bishop's Court, February 17th, 1865.

"My dearest boy—We all thought it possible that you might have come by this steamer, and the children were at Zonnebloem to meet you. Though I have given up the thought of going to England for the present, I am not sorry that you should see how a large English parish is worked. If Kidderminster is worked as it used to be twenty years ago, you will see, and, I hope, learn, a good deal there. . . . You will feel that it is with much anxiety that I look for the P. C. judgment. So much as to my own course, and the well-being, if not the being, of the Church depends upon it, that I am more than usually disturbed. I may at any moment be plunged into a struggle, the issue of which it is impossible to foresee, but which may end in my ruin and death. Gladly should I take counsel with devoted men in England at each step, but it is impossible. My presence is needed here, and men like Keble and the Bishop of Oxford urge me not to come. The difficulties which beset my path are very great, and nothing is easier than to make blunders amid manifold perplexities; but God, Whom I wish to serve, will, I trust, guide me aright, that I may do His Will. . . . You ask, what is the exact answer to any one who says—'You received letters patent from the Queen, and promised to obey her,—you must therefore hold yourself subject to the P. C. decisions.' The fact is not so. I received letters patent. They were a contract to which the Queen, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and myself as representing the Church in Africa, were parties. We mutually contracted that I should have and exercise the full power of Metropolitan, *i.e.* try my Suffragans; and so far from acknowledging

P. C., we contracted that the Archbishop of Canterbury in person should revise my proceedings, and ousted the jurisdiction of the Privy Council. The letters patent were sent to the Archbishop for his approval, and they were framed when the Chancellor was Attorney-General, and submitted to him."

To the Same.

"March 14th, 1865.

"My dearest boy—I am glad to have so full an account of your work at Kidderminster, but you are overstraining the machine, and cannot go on with that sort of life very long. The body and mind want rest and recreation, and you appear to be taking none. I like your method and system in work. . . . You say that you would like to remain where you are for some time. You must decide for yourself. I do not see any prospect of my going home. If I have a fight to fight, I believe I shall do it more effectually here than in England. I need not say that we shall be very glad to see you here, but I wish you to choose for yourself. I had desired to see you Curate to the Dean for a time, and there is a vacancy there just now; but I have a reluctance to influence you. . . . You will learn much, I doubt not, at Kidderminster, and Claughton is an excellent man to be under. . . . The girls say that I am to *order* you to come home!"

To the Same.

"April 11th, 1865.

"My dearest boy—Your letters describing your work interest me much. I am thankful, very thankful, to see you devoting yourself to it so zealously. I think, however, that you are inclined to stick too close to the house-to-house part of it, and that you should take some relaxation. You will find that this is necessary after a time. The mind must be unbent, and mind and body both need change. I should take some recreation, however short, daily. You will last the longer for this. Then I think that the work will become shallow, external, unreal, unless the flame of your own devotion is fed in private.

Holy Scripture read with a view to this is what I would chiefly commend to you; and then such a book as Thomas à Kempis. Your mother and I have both derived much good from that book. I have no doubt, however, but that you will feel your need of this, and that as you do your work unsparingly and conscientiously, you will grow in spiritual strength. You must remember, also, that you cannot always be letting out—that you must all along be taking in. Reading and thought are essential to freshness in ministrations. If there be, however, one thing that will help you, it will be the looking up continually to Christ on His Throne, the realising more fully, daily, His present and His past work for us. And now as to the future. You must decide for yourself. I confess that I should be glad to have you working for a time in Cape Town, but you must judge yourself what is best for you, and where you can serve God most. . . . Your mother and I have just returned from a short ride of 300 miles. We have been in the Cold Bokkeveld, where I never was before, and I have lamed my horse badly. . . . I have encouraging and interesting letters from Bishop Tozer and from the Bishop of Mauritius relative to the new Madagascar Mission."

Meanwhile the much-discussed judgment of the Judicial Committee was given, March 20th, 1865,[1] the Chancellor, Lord Cranworth, the Dean of the Arches, and Master of the Rolls (Romilly), being present. The judgment in full will be found in the Appendix. The pith of their Lordships' opinion lies in their final sentence, which pronounces the Metropolitan's sentence on his Suffragan to be null and void in law, on the ground that by law the Crown has no power to constitute a Bishopric, or to give any coercive jurisdiction, in a Colony which has its own independent legislature; a decision which touches both the Sees of Cape Town and Natal, which received their existing letters patent after such independent legislature had been acquired by the respective Colonies. Practically it would seem that in the eye of the Privy Council there was no

[1] Appendix VIII.

See either of Cape Town or of Natal in existence, or any Bishop either! and consequently a judgment involving the existence of both must be null and void! "Does it follow," (was asked), "that the Crown has legal authority to declare it void?" In the beginning of the judgment the Judicial Committee stated that the Bishops are both ecclesiastical persons, created Bishops by the Queen in exercise of her authority as Sovereign of the realm and head of the Established Church; —that they received and held their Dioceses under grants made by the Crown, and are the creatures of English law;— at the end of it they say that the Queen, as head of the Established Church, is depositary of the ultimate ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and refer to Act 25 Henry VIII., which, coupled with a previous Act, defined the course of Ecclesiastical Appeals—from Archdeacon to Bishop, Archbishop, and finally the Crown;—and they say that if there were no final resort of the Sovereign in a case like this, there would be a denial of justice.

So far the Judicial Committee. But, as Churchmen were prompt to perceive, Lord Westbury's judgment involves two distinct propositions,—first, that the Metropolitan's proceedings were the exercise of nothing more than a voluntary jurisdiction, having no compulsory or legal force; and secondly, that the Crown has nevertheless jurisdiction to interfere with those proceedings, and as far as it can to annul them.

The two propositions (it was said in the *Guardian* of March 22nd, 1865), "are both, as it is obvious, of the greatest moment, but they involve very different considerations, and are, at first sight at all events, by no means equally tenable. Indeed they seem to be hardly consistent the one with the other. . . The Chancellor lays down the first of the two propositions with a breadth that is open at least to observation. He decides, to speak briefly, that there is no such thing in nature, or at least in law, as what is usually known as a Colonial Bishop. There may be indeed, if we look to foundations of the good old times of William IV. and George IV., or perhaps a little earlier, when Acts of Parliament were passed for sending Bishops out to

Calcutta or Jamaica, a Bishop or two to be found still in some of our Colonial dependencies, who, dating from these undeniable charters, have as good legal Dioceses as even the Archbishop of Canterbury or the Bishop of London. But the established 'Colonial Bishop,' the Bishop consecrated 'by virtue' of letters patent—the Bishop whom we have sent, in some cases but yesterday—in others ten, twelve, or twenty years ago, to perform the work of an Evangelist among the Africans or Australians,—to found in New Zealand a branch of the Christian Church, or to organise and overlook on the vast Continent of Australia the ministry of the Word of God;—this Bishop, who for years and years we have led ourselves and the world to believe was endowed with such powers as the Crown could confer, for exercising his office in the sphere which by that authority was allotted to him, now turns out after all to be a mockery and a sham; to have no Diocese; to have no patent, except one which is absolutely 'null and void;' and to be in fact, as far as the law of England goes, if a Bishop at all, at least a Bishop of nothing! This in effect, says Lord Westbury's last judgment, is the real result of all that has been done in this department for the last twenty years. Everything was done, or purported to be done, by the Crown. But the Crown, though it could or at least did command the consecration of a Bishop, had no power (without Parliament) to assign to him any Diocese—no power to give him any sphere of action,—and still further, no power to constitute in such assumed Diocese any coercive jurisdiction whether ecclesiastical or other.

"Grant that this be true, though perhaps great lawyers and statesmen must have been somewhat torpid only to have suddenly found it all out;—but grant that the Crown had exceeded its powers in affecting to make Colonial Bishops and Metropolitans—that for years most important powers should have been unhesitatingly disposed of and conferred without a question, until, suddenly, the very power which so conferred them asserts them to have always been unreal, worthless, and ridiculous;—how then can the Crown have power to interfere

and reverse the sentences of what itself declares to be a purely voluntary body?

"Lord Westbury says that 'the question whether the Bishop of Cape Town's proceedings have the effect which is attributed to them by him is one of the gravest importance;' and therefore, he argues, 'it is one which we are bound to decide.' But the question is not whether the Council is *bound*, but whether it is *entitled*, to decide. Neither does his Lordship venture on the attempt to prove—what he also asserts—that 'it was not legally competent for the Bishop of Natal to give, or the Bishop of Cape Town to accept or exercise, any such voluntary jurisdiction.' We beg most respectfully to ask why it was not? The decision in Long *v.* Cape Town assumes that it was or would have been so, and the plainest and most elementary propositions of law are directly at variance with the contrary assumption. Now, according to that judgment, the Bishop of Cape Town is a Bishop of the Church of England duly consecrated, but holding no legal diocese, and possessing no legal jurisdiction, in a place where, according to that judgment, the Church is only a voluntary body, 'in no better position, and also in no worse,' than any other voluntary body, 'where the Crown has no power to assign him a Diocese or give him a jurisdiction, and himself taking nothing and owing nothing from or to the Crown, except the letters patent, which purport to confer on him impossibilities and contradictions, and which on that very account are confessedly and purely a nullity. If this be so, the Bishop of Cape Town is, in the eye of the law, simply an unbeneficed clerk—personally a Bishop, no doubt, but a Bishop simply and absolutely without jurisdiction. Is it, then, possible to maintain that any assumed exercise of jurisdiction by such a Bishop—whether it assume to be Episcopal, Metropolitan, or other—is capable of being dealt with as if it were a legal act, and therefore of being appealed from to the regular tribunals of this country? Can such an assumption of jurisdiction stand, in short, on any other footing, or be in either a better or worse position, than the jurisdiction lately exercised in this country by Cardinal Wiseman, or that un-

doubtedly exercised by the Wesleyan Conference? The cases are not distinguishable; yet the Committee of Council actually claim, and are exercising, a right of sitting in judgment, by way of appeal, from the jurisdiction in question; a jurisdiction which in the very same judgment they have themselves pronounced to be, because it is thus voluntary, simply, and absolutely a nullity. . . . The Cape Town sentence on Dr. Colenso had, before this judgment, such force, and such force only, as it could derive from the rules and usages of the voluntary religious society in and for which it was pronounced; and such force, neither less nor more, it has now. Legal force it has none, nor did it ever pretend to any."

There are few intelligent Churchmen but must vividly remember the excitement and just indignation of that spring; and the newspapers were inundated with articles and letters upon a subject which roused all the best and strongest feelings of religion, justice, and loyalty to the Church among her sons, as well as ill-disguised triumph and hope of seeing her discomfited among her foes, and, alas! sometimes among those who should have been found her faithful children and supporters.

In the House of Commons Mr. Dunlop put two important questions (March 27th) to the Government, arising out of the decision of the Privy Council:—Whether the Government intended to advise her Majesty to abstain henceforth from issuing such illegal patents? and from appointing successors to Bishops who, now holding them, might die or resign?—referring especially to Canada, where all connection between Church and State was abolished.

Mr. Cardwell answered that, with respect to Canada, letters patent had been for some time discontinued, and that no more would be issued to any Colony until the matter had been duly weighed by Government.

Mr. Dunlop then asked, "To what extent and effects, if any, patents erecting Episcopal Sees in Colonies having representative legislatures, or in which the Church of England had not been previously by law established, and purporting to convey ecclesiastical jurisdiction, were valid and operative?"

To this the Attorney-General replied that it was very much easier, especially after the recent decision, to say what was *not* the effect of these letters patent than what it was. But he would endeavour to put the best interpretation he could upon that decision. "In the first place, I understand it to be determined that no legal Dioceses are created by these letters patent in the Colonies to which the question has reference. Secondly, that these letters patent create no legal identity between the Episcopal Church presided over by these Bishops and the United Church of England and Ireland. Thirdly, that the letters patent do not introduce into these Colonies any part of the English ecclesiastical law. Fourthly, that they confer on the Bishops no legal jurisdiction or power whatever, and add nothing to any authority which the Bishops may have acquired by law, or by the voluntary principle, without any letters patent or royal sanction at all. There remains nothing, therefore, that the letters patent could do, except it be, as I understand, simply to incorporate the Bishops and their successors as a legal Corporation, with all its ordinary incidents."

Perhaps this is the fittest place in which to record a few weighty words written by Dr. Pusey, upon the subject, to the *Churchman* :—

"Friends and foes seem to be agreed about the importance of this last decision of the Privy Council. It must have effects far other, probably, than its acute authors were aware of. It looks at first sight as if it were producing chaos; yet to us who believe that 'the Spirit of God moveth upon the face' of the wild waters, it is but the chaos over which God says, 'Let there be light, and there was light.' The judgment dissolves all legal jurisdiction which was supposed to exist in the African Church, but only to make an opening for Divine order. It is no loss to us that it is discovered that the Queen had no power to give the temporal powers which the former legal advisers of the Crown thought she could. It is the Crown deciding against itself. It is no concern of ours which of the two sets of lawyers was right. The present advisers of her Majesty have limited her powers, and we may thank God for

the limitation, and pardon gladly the gratuitous insolence of the Erastianism of the preamble for the results which, with no goodwill of Erastians, must result from it.

"The Church of South Africa, then, is free, and this freedom is far better than a temporal jurisdiction created by the State. It is the temporal jurisdiction which is the weakness of the Church. Had the decision against Dr. Williams and Mr. Wilson in the Court of Arches involved only spiritual consequences, it would not have been made legal for Clergymen to deny Hell or the Inspiration of God's Word. The South African Church will have to organise itself as the Scotch Church and the Church in the United States had to do before it; and as the Church in the United States rose from the dust in which it had been trampled, and flourished as it did not when under the patronage of the State, so by God's help will the African. We cannot doubt that the Bishops there (I do not of course speak of Dr. Colenso) will abide under the oath which they have taken, without troubling themselves to consider whether the Bishop of Cape Town was made Metropolitan legally, according to human law. He was Metropolitan *de facto;* as such they took their oaths to him. Cape Town is marked out naturally as the Metropolitical See, and such it will doubtless remain.

"The organisation of the South African Church is then complete. Had the Bishops been (as we are told by the Judicial Committee) 'creatures of [human] law,' they would have expired with the law. But since, as we know, the Episcopate has a Divine right, and is a Divine institution, the withdrawing of human props will only show that it endures through a Divine strength lodged in it. English Churchmen will have, doubtless, occasion to help to support the South African Clergy; but what seems to be defeat, in God's Hands turns to victory. The Church of England is freed from all complicity with Dr Colenso, over whom, neither directly nor indirectly, has it any jurisdiction, and the African Church is free.—Yours faithfully,

"E. B. PUSEY."

Probably we may assume that the mind of very many

thoughtful men was represented in the following remarks contained in a letter to the *Guardian* of March 29th.

"I. It would appear that in future no Colonial Bishops will be appointed by the Crown. The Crown cannot, with dignity, appoint where it confers no authority; the temper of the Privy Council is sufficient warning to the Colonies not to desire what can only be a pretext for interference.

"II. With this reserve there is probably little to be apprehended from the arbitrary and illogical claims put in by the Privy Council. They are the last relics of an anomalous system. They will save Dr. Colenso from the honours of a pecuniary martyrdom, and having done this, we may hope they will be buried for ever. But,

"III. The decision opens for the Colonial Church questions of which it is hardly possible to overestimate the magnitude."

Bishop Gray was meanwhile continuing his habitual earnest attention to the daily cares of his large Diocese, while awaiting the decision which anyway could not but affect him so considerably. He writes—

To Mrs. WILLIAMSON.

"Bishop's Court, April 28, 1865.

"My dearest Annie—Our mail for England leaves before that from England arrives, which will, I presume, bring us the judgment. I have not much to say, but send you a few lines of brotherly feeling. For the first time these seventeen years and more I feel in a position to throw myself heartily into the pastoral work of my Diocese, and if the P. C. should not force me into a great struggle, I shall feel comparatively at leisure. A great anxiety and difficulty hanging over one absorbs the mind and checks its energies. I feel, however, that with a few more thousands (you will think me moderate!) I could work out many plans, as to which I am at present crippled." (Here follows an account of several works going on in the Diocese.) . . . "I had a charming letter last mail from an American Bishop. He says the whole Episcopate of America goes with

me, and will be prepared to say so, if need be, in Synod. I am afraid that this is more than our English Bishops will do, judging from their most disappointing debate in Convocation about the Court of Appeal. May God guide us all aright in this matter. I have never seen any reason to change my view as to my duty, if the judgment should reinstate Colenso. I can have no doubt as to what our Master would have us do."

To the Same.

"May 12th, 1865.

. . . "The mail has not arrived, but the judgment has by a stray ship. It carves out plenty of anxious work for us all, but it does not alarm us. We will, God helping, use the opportunity to rid ourselves of all connection with the State, the royal supremacy in spiritual things, and all these claims which, alas! hang so fearfully about our Mother Church, and which she has not yet learnt cordially to hate. My chief anxieties now are as to how the Church in Natal will receive the excommunication, and whether the Mother Church will come boldly forth and witness for Christ. If she is silent now, I will do everything in my power to force her Bishops to say openly whether they are in communion with the orthodox Church of Africa, or with the heretical Bishop. With both they cannot be. I believe that this wicked judgment will be the means of conferring great blessings on the Church, and I am not at all disheartened. I pray daily, hourly, for guidance, and I believe I have it. My Clergy write very affectionately. . . . I have scarce a moment for writing, but I thought that you would like to have a line just to hear that, foreseeing much trouble and persecution, I am not in the least cast down. I have nothing to unlearn from this judgment, as some who have opposed me now feel they have. God helping, I will go forward in the course long since marked out; but I am thinking of having brass ikons of the Lord Chancellor put up in all our Churches, that all may do obeisance!"

To Edward Gray, Esq.

"Bishop's Court, May 9th, 1865.

"My dear Edward—The *Asia* brought us a letter from Charlie, and the substance of the judgment, but it does not disturb me. The promise is, 'No weapon formed against thee shall prosper,' and this dart of Satan shall tend to the furtherance of Christ's Cause and Kingdom. The freedom of the Church will be secured; even the power of Bishops will be exalted by it; the Church cannot do without them; it must take them now on their own terms. I never felt more sure of my ground than I now do. The judgment has endorsed all my views about our relation to the Mother Church: our proper title; our being wholly without law save as framed by ourselves; the worthlessness of letters patent. The only regret I have is that I was made to appear and plead before those crafty and designing lawyers! My own grounds of action and my views and convictions were not put forward; and yet they are the only grounds left for us to act upon. The judgment, of course, denies our religious liberties and refuses us toleration. We are a voluntary religious association, in the same position as any other; and yet we are the only body who cannot rid ourselves of false teachers! We shall see. I shall of course follow the line long since marked out if Colenso returns. I have had a sharp attack, but am, thank God, well again. I had hoped that my conflicts were over, but it is ordained otherwise. I hope now to have a Provincial Synod, on the Bishop of Graham's Town's return, with the Clergy and Laity. Really the upshot of all this is that the Bishops must stand up and say, Here are we, the Bishops of the Church of S. Africa; we are a voluntary religious association; these are our terms; who likes to join us? The Provincial Synod must lay down, as it has already in part done, the laws and regulations of our particular religious association. What can the rest do but accept them or quit the association? Of course I will never have anything to do with Parliaments. God be thanked that we have

escaped almost entirely (and shall soon escape altogether) these fetters forged by States for the bondage of the Church of God. I have long hated the word *Establishment;* I could not endure it as a boy. The chains that hang about us still are light compared with what they were. We shall never rest till we have flung them altogether from us.

"Now you will remember that I have not yet seen, still less weighed, this remarkable document in its entirety. I suppose I must address the Archbishop of Canterbury, but I shall take time. People, I am told, are pitying me very much, and suppose that I shall now leave Africa. Those who opposed Synods, and exalted the supremacy, and charged me with intending to secede from the Church of England, and spoke of ecclesiastical laws, are much confounded, and don't know what to think or say. I trust that God will guide me with His counsel, and strengthen me for His work. Very many people of whom I never heard, I am told, pray for me, and not a few write to say so. I feel, in the words of to-day's Psalm, 'The Lord of Hosts is with us, the God of Jacob is our refuge.' My next anxiety will be as to the effect produced by the sentence of excommunication. It will excite the wrath of many; but it is the only means the Church has left for purging herself. Clarke says that the Bishop of Oxford talks of a Council of Colonial Bishops in England. I fear that they would not do much. Very many have the misfortune to have acts of their local legislature. I believe these are broken reeds which will pierce all who lean upon them. . . . Cannot you stir up —— to urge the Colonial Bishops' council to demand of the Crown the restoration of fees for letters patent? They would more than endow the See of Natal over again. An action would, I believe, recover them. These baubles have cost £10,000 at least."

To the Rev. CHARLES NORRIS GRAY.

"May 9th, 1865.

"The judgment in full has not yet arrived. It has overreached itself. Intending to destroy the power of Bishops, the

Lord Chancellor bids fair to exalt it. They really are the masters of the position. The judgment makes the 'ecclesia in episcopo' to be a maxim for the nineteenth century. I had an amusing talk with our worthy Governor, who is in great trouble himself. He is a thorough Church and State man of the old school, and has bothered me a good deal with his notions. But he is alarmed at the overthrow of all his views, and the endorsement of mine as to our true status, by the judgment. He said, 'What are we to do?' I replied, 'Nothing.' He thought we must resolve ourselves into a voluntary religious association, and I gathered that it was to elect me, and, of course, devolve what powers it liked upon me. 'Oh no,' said I; 'we *are* a voluntary religious association; we have been ever since I came here, and those have joined it who liked, and we have been a *visible* association ever since I held my first Synod. It is for me to say whether I will take you into my association, and on what terms.' This was rather a new idea to him, and I think it will be to many others when they find it out."

To the Bishop of Oxford.

"Bishop's Court, May 15th, 1865.

"I have very nice encouraging letters from the Archbishop, Keble, Pusey, W. Palmer, and others. All concur in your view as to proceeding to the election of another Bishop. I shall write this week to all the Clergy of Natal. . . . At this crisis I think the Church should say openly before the world that it will hold no communion with Colenso; for what concord hath Christ with Belial, or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? It must say this sooner or later, but its saying so *now* might be the means of giving victory to the Truth. I believe the American Church will say this in Synod. It will be a great reproach to us if she is the first to say it. . . . I am sure that you and the dear Archbishop, and the Bishops of Salisbury, and, I hope, Llandaff and Lincoln, feel with us; but you will say that, with the Bishops of London and St. David's sure to oppose, and others timid and more than timid,

it would be very difficult to get Convocation to act. I know it is so, but I pour out my heart freely to you, as to a friend who will bear with me. I shall be intensely disappointed if nothing should be done before the dissolution, and I think that in that case the Church will have failed in a plain duty at a very critical time. As to the excommunication, I am ready to hold back as long as possible, and I am most thankful to be advised by you and others to push the consecration, for I have always believed that to be the right course."

To Miss COLE.

"May 19th, 1865.

. . . "I have had very heavy work in the way of writing lately—indeed, my life is one long letter, and the poor wife has quite as much in this line. My belief is that the judgments of Civil Courts in Divine things have done more to shake men's confidence in British justice than anything that has happened in my time; and I see very plainly that we are rapidly approaching the collision state between the temporal and spiritual sword. The Dutch Church here is just putting forward a determined protest against the Supreme Court, and affirming in the strongest and most uncompromising language the spiritual independence of the Church of Christ. I hope that gradually the lay mind may be leavened, and its faith deepened. . . . I am, of course, trying to guide the poor Church of Natal aright at this crisis. It ought to have been encouraged openly by the Archbishop to elect its own Bishop. He has recommended this in a nice letter to me, but I do not feel authorised to publish it. *All* leaders at home who have yet written to me, I am thankful to say, urge this line. . . . The Church will never right herself in England till she has recovered her spiritual judges for spiritual causes."

To the Hon. Mrs. MURRAY.

"May 27th, 1865.

. . . "We have had a very simple duty to perform, and shall, I hope, have grace given (I believe in no small measure

through the prayers of the faithful at home) to witness truly for Christ and His Church. Happen what will, the judgment does not alarm me, and never did for a moment. If *we* are true to ourselves and our Lord, the world and its Courts cannot hurt us. I believe that it is through these Courts that Satan chiefly assails the Faith and the Church in our days, and that a conflict is at hand. The very same line that the Privy Council has taken with regard to us is being adopted now by Judges here as regards the Dutch Communion, and is met by a declaration of principles which is very good. These things may draw Christian men nearer each other."

To the Rev. JOHN KEBLE.

"Bishop's Court, May 23rd, 1865.

"My dear Mr. Keble—Let me thank you and dear Mrs. Keble very heartily for your kind joint letter of April 7th. I feel much joy in hearing from yourself that our gracious God is restoring you, and I will yet hope, for the Church's sake, that you may be again quite what you were before your illness.

"You will be glad to know what I have done. All my letters from leaders in the Church, from the Archbishop downwards, pointed, as the next step, to the election of a Bishop by the Church of Natal, and to its organisation of itself as a voluntary religious association in communion with the Church of England. I have therefore urged this course upon the Church in that Colony, being, I need scarce say, one in entire accordance with my own view; and I have furnished the Dean with extracts from yours, Dr. Pusey's, W. Palmer's, the Bishops of Graham's Town and Oxford, and the Archbishop's letters, to be read privately to any gathering of Clergy and representative laity. I have done this because Colenso has taken great pains to impress upon the public here that I stand alone—that he is the representative Bishop of the Church of England, I the head of a Secession Church; and because at this crisis I felt that other influences besides my own should be brought to bear upon the feeble Church of Natal, and guide it to a right deci-

sion. The Clergy there, though with a single exception hostile to Dr. Colenso, are not a united body, and the laity as a body are untaught as to matters relating to the faith, and have, I fear, in too many instances been misled by the teaching and writings of him who has been their Chief Pastor for nine years. During all that time I have had but little intercourse with them, and knew nothing of the greater number both of Clergy and laity till my Visitation there last year. Under these circumstances, with my own position declared to be *nil*, I felt bound to try and guide the Church aright by the weight of authority placed in my hands for my guidance. I shall look with great anxiety and many prayers for the issue. . . . I regret very much that it has not been possible for the Mother Church, through the Archbishop, openly to announce to us that it will have no communion with the deposed heretic. There would, I suppose, be no violation of law in such an announcement? It would greatly have strengthened our hands, and I venture to think that it would greatly strengthen the Church of England. It must come to this if Natal elects ——. As to the excommunication, happily the time has not yet arrived for it. When it does, it will, I trust, appear to be the natural, if not necessary, course. I have myself no scruples as to not acting if driven thereto. It was in Synod, after invoking the Help and Guidance of the Holy Spirit, that we unanimously decided upon it. I do not myself see how it could take place before November. Much may have arisen before then to clear up our path of duty. As to the future, if Natal is guided aright, I am hopeful, though there are innumerable difficulties in the way of our organising ourselves; *e.g.*, I suppose the Bishop of St. Helena has coercive jurisdiction, and that probably I am his legal Metropolitan, through his letters patent. His is an Established Church.

"One of our greatest difficulties will be as to the extent to which we should adopt Canons as our laws. In principle we should adopt all that the Church of England has received. As a fact many of these would be unsuitable to us. Church lawyers would render good service if they would publish a

Compendium of Church law, which new Churches would do well to adopt as the basis of their laws. But I must not weary you. I am sure I need not say how grateful many of us feel for your kindnesses, extending over many years, to this African Church.—Believe me ever, faithfully and affectionately yours, R. CAPETOWN."

To the LORD BISHOP of GRAHAM'S TOWN.

"Bishop's Court, May 24th, 1865.

"My dear Bishop—All my letters, from the Archbishop downwards, concurred with yours as to the next step being the election of a Bishop by the Church in Natal, and its organisation of itself as a voluntary religious association in communion with us and with the Church of England. I have therefore urged this course upon them. . . . As to the future, at present we are not called upon to act, but my first thoughts run in this direction. On your return,[1] Bishops representatives of Clergy and laity from each Diocese,—St. Helena, Free State, Natal, Graham's Town, and Cape Town,—meet here in Conference, with an understanding that the Conference would probably end in a Provincial Synod. We agree in Conference upon a line. Then the Bishops meet in Synod, and lay down principles, and agree to invite Clergy and Laity. These form the mixed Synod, and Clergy and laity assent to what Bishops have done. This the centre and basis of our voluntary association. All join us who like upon these terms. The Church of England declares herself to be in communion with this body. I cannot call a Provincial Synod of mixed Clergy and Laity. A future Privy Council would say that it was no Synod at all (as they did say in the Long case), but a concoction of my own brain. It seems to me that we Bishops are the only essential parts of this voluntary association, and that all steps towards organisation must *formally* proceed from us. I hope that you will have many opportunities of talking over this scheme with those able to advise, and of working out some plan for organising a voluntary religious association that will stand the test of P. C.

[1] Bishop Cotterill had gone to England that spring.

enmity. One of the things that the Colonial Church wants now more than ever, is a basis of Ecclesiastical Law. As a branch of the Church, we must, I think, adopt all the Canon Law which the church of England has adopted, so far as applicable to our circumstances. But we want a code for our adoption deduced from the ancient Canons. I wish Phillimore would induce some one to take the subject up. I think that before we hold a Synod we must respectfully send back our letters patent to the Secretary of State. As long as we hold these we shall have the chains which Lord Westbury has wound round us, clinging to us. We must disconnect ourselves entirely from the Crown, and declare that we do not resign the office and trust committed to us by the Church, as Bishops in this land. I trust that you will vehemently resist the idea of any more letters patent. They are clearly of no earthly use to us; but Mr. Cardwell will, I doubt not, for the sake of keeping the Church in bondage, strive to retain them in some form. . . . I pray you very earnestly maintain your independence."

To Edward Gray, Esq.

"Bishop's Court, May 29th, 1865.

"My Clergy meet on Thursday to consider what their duty is. . . . Do not distress yourself about consenting to my appearing by counsel. My own judgment is still against it. I think that I should have stood in a better position if I had never appeared. But men in these days so shrink from taking responsibility upon them at critical times, that I really feel thankful to you and the Bishop of Oxford for acting, under these circumstances, as you thought for the best. Indeed it may have been for the best. The lawyers did not take my line, and yet it is the only line that the judgment has endorsed, and which we must ever hereafter take. I let lawyers draw up my sentence, but I did not like it. My line would not have been the same. It is the weak point in my judgment, and James fell foul of it. Really, however, nevertheless, a Judge and a leading Counsel here were paid by me for drawing it up. . . . I am appalled at the length of time which must elapse

before we can thoroughly right ourselves. It will take two years for the Church here to organise itself thoroughly."

To the BISHOP of OXFORD.

"Bishop's Court, June 11th, 1865.

"My dear Bishop—I inclose you a copy of the Natal Clergy Resolutions, of which I was able to send a copy, with a few hurried lines, to the dear Archbishop, two days ago. You will praise God for them; they are an answer to our prayers. . . . What will the *Times* say to the Clergy claiming Hildebrand, of whom they were relieved, for their Metropolitan, and discarding the Council's Bishop? The extracts from yours and the Archbishop's letters, privately used, have been of great service in showing laymen that I do not stand alone, but have the confidence of the Church at home. . . . I do hope that the Church, *as a Church*, will break silence. Individuals are most kind, and I get many addresses and assurances of many prayers for us. But we want *the Church* to speak.

To the Rev. JOHN KEBLE.

"Bishop's Court, June 11th, 1865.

"My dear Mr. Keble—I must send you a few lines with the enclosed, which will rejoice your heart, as it has done mine. God has given grace to our brethren in Natal to do their duty. Men, formerly disunited, have had but one heart and one mind. It is an answer to the many prayers that have been offered here and at home.

The Dean, whom you know and have helped, has been, under God, the stay of the Church in this hour of trial. The meeting with the Laity is fixed for St. Peter's Day, the anniversary of my consecration. If spared till then, I shall enter on the nineteenth year of my Episcopate. I shall be anxious, because the Laity have been in several, if not many cases, seduced by Colenso, and love the idea of a Queen's Bishop and free discussion. But still I believe our Lord is with us, and will overrule men's hearts, and so guide events that they shall minister to the advancement of His kingdom and the

maintenance of the Faith. If the Laity will take no action about a Bishop, the Clergy will still act alone. They are very determined about the Metropolitan consecrating. The weakest point is asking the whole Home Episcopate to elect. It was done to commit them to a recognition of the deposition; but if we are free to act, it does not follow that they are, and the selecting and gaining consent of all to a man would throw immense and undue labour upon the Archbishop. I have made private use of your letter, to show that I don't stand alone. It was absolutely necessary, for efforts have been made by Colenso and others to mislead people's minds on this point, and make them believe, with the *Times*, that I am a second Hildebrand."

The document inclosed was the report of a meeting of the Clergy of Natal on May 31st, 1865, in which resolutions were passed—

I. To the effect that the spiritual power of the Bishop of Cape Town was in no way affected by the late declaration of the P. C., that the coercive powers conferred by his letters patent were null and void; the subscribers, "in order to give validity in her Majesty's Courts to her pious intention (*i.e.* in the original letters patent now declared null and void), "and for the purpose of testifying to the Right Reverend the Bishop our consent to, and acceptance of, his Metropolitical government, do declare and make known that we have received, and do receive, the most Reverend Father in God, Robert Gray, D.D., commonly called Bishop of Cape Town, as our Metropolitan, and do and will render him obedience in the same degree and after the same manner as the Priests and Deacons of the Church of England in the ecclesiastical province of Canterbury are bound to obey the Archbishop of Canterbury, until such time as in a Provincial Synod the organisation of the Church of South Africa shall have been settled," etc.

II. That the above resolution be communicated by the Dean to the Metropolitan and to the English Archbishops, together with

III. a Declaration of Clerical and Lay Members of the

Church to the effect that they are satisfied of the justice of Dr. Colenso's degradation, and reject him as Bishop.

To this was added a IVth Resolution that the Clergy and Lay delegates should meet June 29th to consider a petition to the English Archbishops and Bishops, stating that they "deeply feel the difficulties under which they labour in consequence of the conduct of Bishop Colenso, and see no means of their speedy removal except the appointment of another Bishop." Should their Lordships agree, the petition begs them to "select for us a man to be our Bishop, whom the Metropolitan may consecrate, and to a Bishop so elected and so consecrated we promise joyfully to pay all due obedience. This course not necessarily to be a precedent for future elections."

Writing of the same meeting and its results to Dr. Williamson, the Bishop says: "It will be a critical day for the South African Church and our whole Communion, but I believe the Holy Ghost is with us, in answer to yours and all our prayers. The Clergy in Natal, a disunited body formerly, see in their harmony and mutual confidence the workings of the Spirit.

"I do not want for this Church sympathy and kind or flattering letters from individuals: I have more than enough of this. But I want *the Church* at home to speak out and say she has communion with us,—she has none with this most wilful and deposed heretical teacher. She owes it to herself to say this, and will suffer more than we shall by silence. I shall probably resign my letters patent, but I shall do nothing hastily. Two of the most important churches in Natal—the Cathedral and the parish church of D'Urban—are vested, as well as all the property in the Diocese of Cape Town, in the See of Cape Town. I must see the bearing of all this before I act. How were Metropolitans made in the Early Church? Did any but Bishops decide who and where they should be? The act of the Bishops in the Upper House of Convocation was as much an act of the Church, as any recognition by the 6th Canon of Nicea, or by the Council of Jerusalem."

While the Church in Natal was petitioning the Fathers in God at home, and the brave Metropolitan was casting himself

and his righteous cause in perfect faith on Him Who is the Judge of judges, the aforesaid Fathers of the Church at home were not indifferent to his trials and claims upon their sympathy and support.

On June 28th, 1865, the Upper House of Convocation was invited by the Bishop of Oxford to express this fully. He proposed to his brethren to agree in an address to the Archbishop as President, to "communicate from this Convocation to the Bishop of Cape Town our expression of sympathy with him under the great trials to which his maintenance of the Faith in his distant part of the Church has subjected him, and our admiration of the courage and loyalty to the truth which has marked the conduct of his whole course with regard to the great invasion of the Faith, as we regard it, which has there been attempted. The position of the Bishop of Cape Town is such that it seems to me to deserve such support at our hands. He has acted under the letters patent of the Crown, which letters patent were drawn out by very high legal authorities and purported to convey to him Metropolitan jurisdiction over the Bishops of the Province which they purported to constitute. A trial has since taken place in England, which, by one of those curious changes of persons, brought forward as chief Judge of the Court the very lawyer who, as Attorney-General, advised and prepared these letters patent, resulted in pronouncing that the letters patent were unlawful, and an extension of the Royal prerogative above the power of the Crown. The head of that Court had therefore the exceedingly painful duty to perform of pronouncing the utter unlawfulness and invalidity of the acts which he had himself solemnly proposed to be submitted for Her Majesty's signature as Her Majesty's Attorney-General. This judgment, which no doubt involved circumstances which were painful to gentlemen learned in the law, also involved great circumstances of pain to those who were the unfortunate subjects of these—as it is now ruled—unlawful stretches of the Royal prerogative. The Bishop of Cape Town, as Metropolitan, supposed that he was acting loyally and dutifully in acting upon the letters patent

granted by the Crown ;—but he had to find afterwards, by this more recent decision, that in depending upon these letters patent he had been led to depend upon what was legally invalid, and did not give him the jurisdiction which, by virtue of those letters patent, he was exercising. I can hardly conceive a more painful position in which to place a man. He was loyally and cordially seconded by the Bishop of Graham's Town and by the other Bishops of the Province, all of whom now find that they had not the power to unite with the Bishop of Cape Town in the act they performed. I think that, considering this act was performed in strict obedience to what at that time the Bishop of Cape Town had every reason to believe to be the law, and that it was performed by him strictly out of love for the truth, and with an earnest desire to discharge rightly the high duties committed to him,—it does well become us to request your Grace to be the medium of communicating from us to him our thankfulness that in such perilous times to the Church there should be found in its highest places in our distant dependencies those who are prepared fearlessly to stand by the Truth of God. I would therefore venture to propose an address to your Grace, praying you to convey our sentiments to the Bishop of Cape Town and the Bishops of the Province, and also to ask the Lower House to concur with us in the address." The Bishop went on to say that the Bishop of Ely, who had been obliged to go in order to read prayers in the House of Lords, had read and expressed his entire assent to the address before going. The address was as follows :—

To the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.

"May it please your Grace—We, the Bishops of the Province of Canterbury, in Convocation under Her Majesty's most royal writ of summons lawfully assembled, pray your Grace as the President of this Synod, and as Primate of all England and Metropolitan, to convey to the Lord Bishop of Cape Town, appointed by Her Majesty's letters patent Metropolitan of the Province of South Africa, and to the Bishops who assembled with him to try, under the powers purported to be conveyed by

letters patent granted by the Crown, a Bishop of the Province accused before them of heresy, the expression of our hearty admiration of the courage, firmness, and devoted love of the truth of the Gospel as this Church has received the same, which has been manifested by him and them under most difficult and trying circumstances. We thank them for the noble stand they have made against heretical and false doctrine, and we trust that even out of the present difficulties and embarrassments with which they are surrounded, it may please God to provide some safeguards for the maintenance of the Faith once committed unto the Saints. All which we pray your Grace to communicate to the Lord Bishop of Cape Town."

The Bishop of Llandaff seconded the motion, expressing his cordial agreement and belief that it was a duty to express warm sympathy with the Bishop of Cape Town, and admiration for the conduct he had pursued. He thought it the Bishops' duty as members of the Church to do this, and he believed that the sentiments expressed in the address were universally felt not in the House of Convocation only, but throughout the Church generally.

The President said that it was a duty he should discharge with very great satisfaction. He thought, he went on to say, that it did become the Church of this country to express such sentiments, more particularly as she had reason to believe that the Church of America was about to do the like. The motion was then put and agreed to.

The address was communicated on ~~the~~ same day to the Lower House, and Archdeacon Denison moved, the Rev. T. W. Joyce seconding, that it be concurred in. Sir H. Thompson opposed it, on the ground that such matters were not the business of Convocation, though expressly saying that he did not object to the address in itself.

The Dean of Westminster then opposed it, endorsing Sir Henry Thompson's objections as to the general inexpediency of such subjects being brought before the House, and also raising a whole series of objections of his own; one prominent feature

of which seemed to be, that the approval of the Bishop of Cape Town involved the condemnation of another prelate (which it unquestionably did, and was intended to do), who was more fortunate apparently in possessing the Dean's sympathy than his Metropolitan could be. The Dean thought that unless every one present had read and could accurately remember all Dr. Colenso's books upon the Pentateuch and Joshua, as well as every item of the Bishop of Cape Town's elaborate judgment, they could not express agreement with the address. He read a letter from a London Clergyman (who appeared unfortunately to be infected with Dr. Colenso's desire to expurgate the Bible and the Faith) in support of his views, and proceeded to say that one reason why his brethren should refrain from condemning Dr. Colenso was, that they could not prevent such condemnation from falling on the head of Bishop Thirlwall,—a remark perhaps more damaging to the Bishop of S. David's than to the cause against which the Dean was pleading! He went so far as to say that the Bishop of S. David's "has said many of the same things in principle that have been condemned at Cape Town, and therefore we could not avoid condemning him if we agree to this address. *You cannot escape this conclusion,* and it is because I wish that this House should be saved the mortification of condemning such a prelate as the Bishop of S. David's, that I ask you not to agree to this address." After this extraordinary cause shown for not condemning heresy in one Bishop, the Dean went on to say that those present ought to have made up their minds on the doctrines of the Atonement, the Eternity of future punishment, the origin of the Pentateuch, etc., if they meant to agree to such an address; and he seemed surprised on hearing the answer, which one certainly might have looked for from well-trained theologians, that they *had* made up their minds. After some remarks on this subject, which produce a general vague impression that the Dean held Holy Scripture, Origen, Alexander Knox, William Law, Coleridge, and S. Anselm, as tolerably equal authorities; and caustically asking whether, if a Clergyman said he believed that Marcus Aurelius or Socrates might possibly have been saved, that made it un-

justifiable for him to hold office in the Church of England?—the Dean went on to speak with tender solicitude of the Judicial Committee, and the alarm he felt lest, by accepting this address, the Lower House should seem to cast a slight upon the legal opinions of that most august body. When the Dean came to a conclusion, Archdeacon Denison answered Sir H. Thompson by saying that it was "idle and futile to do anything for the Church of England, unless they maintained the Faith of the Church of England." He believed that many people, who did not understand what Convocation was good for, had learnt, since it had condemned *Essays and Reviews*, and the Bishop of Natal's book. As to not being up in the documents, a man might as well go up for Ordination and say he did not know the Prayer-book. "In the House of Commons it would not do for a man sent as a representative to get up and say: 'Mr. Speaker, I do not know what is going on, I do not know about this thing, and therefore it must be put off.' You would be laughed at in the House of Commons if you did that." The substantial point of the address had been carried, the Archdeacon argued, when Convocation condemned the book, and every one of the principles gone into,—there was nothing new, as the Dean said. Here the Dean of Westminster explained that he had alluded only to the Colonial Bishops.

Archdeacon Denison said that no doubt the Crown was wrongly advised some time ago, but that did not alter the substance of the question. It was a mere technical matter. After recapitulating the position of the South African case in a few graphic sentences, the Archdeacon ended by saying—"The Church of England is asked to sympathise with the Bishop of Cape Town; let us give him God-speed, and let us do what we can to strengthen his hands."

The Dean of Westminster proposed to move that the address be not considered, but the Prolocutor objected to this as irregular and disrespectful to the Upper House; and at his suggestion the Dean changed his motion into one asking for more time to consider the address.

Dr. Williams seconded the Dean, confessing that *he* "had

the greatest difficulty in accepting this mode of complimenting one Bishop at the expense of another (!), though he might feel that the Bishop of Cape Town had considerable call to do what he did, and not doubting, though he (Dr. Williams) did not know the particulars, that he had acted according to his lights."

Perhaps the Dean may have felt less grateful for this peculiar line of support than did the Archdeacon for Dr. Jelf's outspoken assurance that he did not feel the smallest necessity for any more time to come to a decision. But he did wish to express, in the strongest terms the English language could afford, his deep sense of the love and affection he bore to the Bishop of Cape Town. He thought it an honour in this generation to be one of those who could take a part in publicly expressing the conviction that "that very eminent, learned, pious prelate has done his duty in a most difficult position in a way that very few men in any generation could be found to do it;" and therefore most cordially, and *ex animo*, with only a feeling of the inadequacy of words to express his heart, he gave his full and hearty concurrence to the address.

After a little more discussion the Dean of Westminster withdrew his amendment, and the original motion was carried.

While these movements were going on, the Bishop was working on in Africa, waiting his time calmly, quite resolved to have nothing to do with Queen's Mandate or Privy Council, prepared to carry out that which he felt his duty to God and the Church, and prepared also to bear with whatever might be harshly and unjustly said of himself. He was also working hard in preparation for his next Synod, "deep in Canons, ancient and modern," among which the Scotch were most helpful to him. "*Mutatis mutandis*, they suit our state very well." He wrote concerning this Synod at length to the Bishop of Graham's Town.

"Bishop's Court, July 7th, 1865.

"My dear Bishop—You will be rejoiced to hear by this mail of the safety of your son and daughter.[1] Their escape

[1] "We have had another sad wreck of one of our great steamers through carelessness. Bishop Cotterill's son, with his wife and child, were wrecked on rocks 150 miles off. They are now with us."

has been very merciful, but their losses, I fear, considerable. Many thanks for your account of the Lambeth meeting. I could have told you that the Bishop of London would start every difficulty.

"I have been working to prepare matter for future deliberation and decision. It appears to me clear that I ought—1st, to summon to meet you here on your return a Provincial Synod of Bishops; 2nd, that I ought to invite each Diocese to send at the same time representatives—Clergy and Laity—to meet us in Conference, with an understanding that the Conference would probably end in a mixed Synod; 3rd, that in Conference we should agree that it is desirable that the Clergy and Laity should be admitted to the Provincial Synod; 4th, that the Bishops in Synod should invite the representatives to attend the present and future Synods, reserving to themselves, however, the right to hold Synods without their presence; *e.g.*, in case of another Colenso.

"Will you let me know whether you agree in this outline, and if so, when you will be back? It will take some months to get so scattered a body together. I am proposing this plan to Welby, Twells, and Natal Clergy. We must be careful *how* we call together our Synod. You remember what P. C. said of my Synod; that it was no Synod, but consisted of sundry Clergy and Laity selected by the Bishop, or elected as he had appointed. . . If you agree to my plan, will you instruct Merriman to get the Clergy and lay representatives to choose four of each order from among themselves to meet in a Conference which will probably resolve itself into a Synod? All need not attend. It is clear, I think, that if the distant Dioceses are to have their fair weight, we must vote by Dioceses. Natal, Free State, St. Helena, would otherwise be swamped by us. I don't think that we shall ever thoroughly clear the ground, and cut ourselves off from interference on the part of the odious and unjust P. C. till we surrender our letters patent. But we must be cautious. Watermeyer thinks that if we did, the law would still recognise us as a Corporation, and the property be safe, but he does not know

how the other Judges would view the matter . . . If we did resign just now, professing to retain our Sees, it might be that men like —— and —— might say that we had changed our relations with the Church at home, and that they owed us no further allegiance. They might assume the position of the so-called Episcopal Secession Congregations in Edinburgh and Glasgow. . . .

"*July* 12*th.*—Mail in. I hear Colenso has taken his passage by the next steamer. Also that S. P. G. is likely to increase our grants. The resolution to consecrate Bishops without letters patent greatly clears our way towards restoring ours. If Watermeyer assures me that the Law Courts will still recognise the See as a Corporation, I think that I shall certainly restore mine before I summon a Synod. . . . Your son, with wife and child, have been some days with us, and are quite well."

The Bishop wrote at some length on the same subject to Dr. Williamson, to whose failing health he alludes:

"July 13th, 1865.

"My dear Richard—I am very sorry to hear that instead of an improvement in the throat, new and unpleasant symptoms appear. What a comfort to be able to feel, as well as read, that the very hairs of your head are all numbered. I have been expecting to hear every month that speech came back as suddenly as it had disappeared. Our Father has ordered it otherwise, and you can say with real submission, "Thy Will be done." Well, if you may not again hope earnestly to plead with men in your own noble church, your prayers for them may be of even more avail. How much there is for hours and days of mental prayer in "Thy Kingdom come!" . . .

"We start, D.V., on August 18th on a three months' Visitation, in order to be ready for a Synod next year, if spared so long, on a Visitation of Natal, from which I unfeignedly shrink. There is now a fierce war raging between the Orange Free State and the Basutos. Bishop Twells is almost shut up in Bloemfontein. Hitherto the advantage has been on the side of

the Basutos. They have swept off an immense number of sheep, cattle, and horses."

The work of the Bishop's son, now a Curate at Kidderminster, was a constant subject of the deepest interest to his father, who, amid all the pressure of his many anxieties, found time to write frequently to him on matters connected with that work.

"May 9th, 1865.

"You ask about reading. I still think that more time should be given to this. It is impossible to work up reading on a sudden. It should be systematic throughout a life; and, if possible, upon a plan. In our day especially, the study of Scripture is essential to every man that would give an answer to any that may ask a reason for the hope that is in him. I would take our Commentaries one by one. I am just beginning Wordsworth's Genesis. Then I would have a course of pure Theology. And I would also have some book on Ecclesiastical History always in hand. You say that you like to keep to one work at a time. So do I, on one subject; but it refreshes my mind to change my subjects, and I don't like to read much on one subject at one time. This, however, depends upon habit and mental constitution. . . Milman's History of Latin Christianity partakes of the laxity of his views; but, taking it altogether, I am disposed to think it the best and most interesting Ecclesiastical History in English. I should be inclined to read one History for a general view, and then work out particular portions. Then I think particular controversies are important. If the Romish Controversy had been studied in the works of our great Divines, men would not have gone over to Rome as they did a few years ago. The study of our seventeenth-century divines convinced me long ago that not only antiquity, as Newman still seems to admit, was on the side of the Church of England, but Catholicity also as regards Articles of Faith.

"I am looking anxiously for the mail with counsels of friends, and for your determination as to the future. If you

had not your sisters here, I should not regret for your own sake, your remaining in England. But I think that the want of a thorough knowledge of each other, which intercourse alone brings, on the part of members of a family, is a very real misfortune. Intimacy among ourselves has been one of the greatest blessings in my own family life. I do not feel that this country has any claims upon my children, and I have no wish that they should remain here after my death."

"May 29th, 1865.

"You ask about dancing and shooting. I should be sorry to hear of you as going to a ball, not because it is a sin to dance, but because a Clergyman being there seems out of place —leaves the impression of light-mindedness and frivolity on others—injures his influence for good. Whether you were to join in a dance in a private house should, I think, depend upon circumstances. In a homely, quiet way, I should see no harm in it; but if these dances are common in a parish, I should see great harm arising from being drawn into attendance at them. I think the safe side is the one which involves self-denial, and that there is always danger in self-indulgence. Insensibly, men who do not adhere to some fixed rule, grow lax. I do not believe that there is any sin in dancing, but the going to dances implies a certain kind of life and society which are better avoided. Where the act is an offence, causes scandal or remark, is a stumblingblock in the way of others, it is wrong. It is the same with regard to shooting. It seems to me that the evil lies in the habit. I think that habitually or frequently to shoot would be very undesirable in a Clergyman. If you were at ——'s, and went out with him and fired, I could see no harm, except that you would have no license."

"July 1st, 1865.

. . . "You say truly that there is great danger of self forcing itself into all our work, of mistaking natural activity for spiritual zeal and devotion. With you I believe that energy of your character makes you throw yourself into your work

with vigour. The danger would be of zeal flagging after the novelty and freshness have worn off. At first the newness of the field and of the work interests and excites—the trial comes when it is stale and disheartening. Then, if the soul looks up to God, there come support and freshness of spirit. Your real usefulness and your perseverance will depend upon your spiritual state, so cultivate the inner life."

"February 22nd, 1866.

"My dearest boy—Your letters about yourself and your work always interest me, the latter especially so, because it shows that you do not mean to be satisfied with external work, but are bent upon inward discipline, and longing for spiritual growth. Self-complacent feelings are very apt to grow up amidst a busy and apparently successful career, especially when, as is the case with a Curate, the chief responsibility is with others, and failure and disappointments have not awakened humility. It strikes me that you are attempting too many things. To your temperament the call to active labour may be a snare. You must read; you cannot always be letting out. If you would feed others, you must feed yourself. I have always, through life, endeavoured to adhere to the rule of keeping morning for study, afternoon for parish work. Whenever I could I remained at home till one o'clock."

"April 13th, 1866.

"Your full and open letters always comfort me. Your last contained some account of little remarks of the Vicar and Mr. K—— about yourself. I have no doubt they were meant for hints, and it would be well for you to attend. You like plain telling of faults, but it is not easy for comparative strangers to do this, and they shrink from it, perhaps not knowing how downright fault-finding would be received. I quite agree with you about the importance of house-to-house visiting, and I am going to meet the Clergy of Cape Town to-day, to try and organise this part of the work more thoroughly; but it is not everything, and if not wisely done,

and with the highest aims, may be useless and even mischievous. I think that you do not attach sufficient importance to Mr. ——'s experience and knowledge of the parish, and that after some more years of experience your own views on certain points will probably be much modified. It is very trying to men who have been long in a position of authority, and have had large experience, to have young fellows urging plans and schemes before them, and arguing them out, and putting them on their defence for not adopting them. They have weighed the matter, and perhaps decided upon their course long before, and it vexes them to have to battle for their own views with those who may think them muffs, but whom they think raw, and perhaps presumptuous. You must guard against the faults hinted at. They are the faults of an earnest, energetic, impatient spirit, and, whatever the Vicar may think about your not being like your father at all, very similar to my own. I have felt just as you feel, and impatience and self-will, and a habit of judging others, and self-confidence, and irritability of temper, have been the evil fruits. You are in many respects very like me, and have the same natural temperament, and therefore the same faults to contend with, so take warning in time. I still think that you are inclined to overdo the physical part of the work, and that you do not reserve sufficient time for reading and for thought. Your work and religious life will be feeble and shallow if you neglect these things. Now you will think that I have dosed you enough!"

To the Rev. the Hon. HENRY DOUGLAS.

"August 16th, 1865.

"My dear Douglas—I see by your letters and some articles in the Church papers that there is a disposition on the part of Churchmen to render pecuniary assistance to the Church in South Africa amid its great difficulties. I therefore write a hurried line to you, who have taken so kind and active a part in helping to relieve me from debts incurred through heavy legal expenses, to say what I think would be the most effectual way of doing so, should the desire exist. The fact that in a few

hours I shall have started on a three months' journey, and have more work to get through than I can accomplish, compels me to be brief.

"I. I do not think that anything should be done for me personally. Thank God, by the kindness of friends in England, I am out of debt, and whatever were given would go to the work.

"II. The desire, I suppose, would be to enable a Church, which is very feeble, to maintain its ground against a legalised opposition to the truth, in a land impoverished beyond all that I could have conceived possible five or six years ago. The Clergy of course must suffer—it is right they should—amid the general distress; but the difficulty of holding on till better times is a very real one, and a body of men who have shown themselves, during these trying times, faithful to their Lord and His revealed truth, are in danger of being starved out. I should be inclined myself to put this forward as our greatest present need. I have great difficulty not merely in meeting the demands on all sides for new Missions to our still heathen population, but in maintaining posts which have been long established, but are greatly weakened in consequence of the diminution of the English population through the hard times.

"III. But we must bear in mind that in all probability the endowment of the See of Natal, which I induced the Church and Societies to give ten years ago, will be taken from us during the remainder of Dr. Colenso's life. If this be so, something must be done to maintain a Bishop for the Church there. Dr. Colenso will have one Clergyman, a Swede whom he ordained, who recognises him as Bishop. Nothing can be done in the Colony to support a Bishop of the true Church there; for first the members of the Church are not sufficiently strong to maintain unaided their own Clergy; and next, the Colony like ours, is in the midst of a financial crisis, and great embarrassments and many failures are the result. That afflicted Diocese must, if it loses its endowment, look to the Mother Church to help it again, and provide Episcopal superintendence for it.

"IV. Were I in a position to do so, I would ask Church-

men to help me to found a Cathedral. I have, however, felt that my office has been to do the rough work of all sorts in this land, and that the erection of a Cathedral must be for another Bishop and another generation; and so I have been content to put up with the old Pagoda, as Davidson used to call it, feeling that while churches, mission chapels, schools, parsonage houses, were still so largely needed, it would be wrong to throw one's efforts into this costly work, however important. The Dean, however, is just now making an effort, under Mr. Butterfield's directions, to do something, if not to beautify and adorn the existing building, yet to cover some of its ugliness; and if the tastes of any led them to help forward such a work, I need scarce say we should be thankful. . . . . During the whole of these painful proceedings we have felt the great value of books, and the need of a good library. Mr. Keble's library has been of essential service to us, but in few ways could more useful help be given than by adding to it. I have not a moment more to spare.—Affectionately yours,

"R. CAPETOWN."

CHAPTER X.

JULY, 1865, TO JUNE, 1867.

VISITATION IN THE KARROO—ADDRESS FROM THE CHURCH PEOPLE IN GEORGE—TRAVELLING ADVENTURES—DEATH OF DR. WILLIAMSON—FAMINE AND DROUGHT IN AFRICA—QUESTIONS OF THE CONFERENCE IN NATAL—BISHOP OF GRAHAM'S TOWN'S REPLY—ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY'S LETTER TO THE DEAN OF MARITZBURG—RETURN OF DR. COLENSO TO NATAL—DISGRACEFUL SCENES—PROTEST OF CHURCHWARDENS—LETTERS PUBLIC AND PRIVATE FROM THE METROPOLITAN TO DR. COLENSO—LETTER FROM THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY TO DR. COLENSO—SENTENCE OF EXCOMMUNICATION—PASTORAL TO THE CLERGY AND LAITY OF NATAL—REV. F. H. COX PROPOSED AS BISHOP OF NATAL—LAST LETTER TO MR. KEBLE—MR. KEBLE'S DEATH—VISIT TO NAMAQUA LAND—STRANGE CHURCH VIEWS IN ENGLAND—CONVOCATION—DEBATE IN THE UPPER HOUSE ON THE QUESTIONS PROPOSED BY NATAL—BISHOP OF OXFORD—MOTION CARRIED—DEBATE IN THE LOWER HOUSE—ARCHDEACON WORDSWORTH—HOUSE OF LORDS—LETTERS FROM BISHOP GRAY TO HIS SON AND OTHERS—VISITATION—"A STATEMENT"—ELECTION OF REV. W. BUTLER AS BISHOP IN PLACE OF DR. COLENSO—CORRESPONDENCE WITH MR. BUTLER—OPINION OF THE PRIMATE AND BISHOP OF OXFORD ON THE ELECTION—"COLENSO *v.* GLADSTONE AND OTHERS"—JUDGMENT OF THE MASTER OF THE ROLLS—PUBLISHED LETTER OF THE METROPOLITAN UPON THE JUDGMENT—CORRESPONDENCE—HINTS ABOUT PREACHING—COPES IN DURHAM CATHEDRAL—SUMMONS TO THE PAN-ANGLICAN SYNOD—THE BISHOP SAILS FOR ENGLAND, JUNE, 1867.

THE Bishop alluded in one of the above letters to a Visitation he felt it right to make, and for which he was preparing. In a letter to his son, dated August 10th, 1865, he says:

"We leave home this day week, and I have my hands full with all sorts of work, and innumerable letters, and am expecting the English mail hourly. I have, however, seen the address of Convocation in a paper, and feel very thankful for it. It will do great good here, and silence the silly charges about separation from the Church of England which have perplexed and disturbed weak minds. It also draws the Church of

England out and strengthens her for a bolder course in future. . . . We shall be a long time this Visitation in the Karroo, amongst outposts and inspecting new places. I do not look forward to it with much satisfaction."

Accordingly the Bishop and Mrs. Gray started in their cart, August 17th, for the Eastern side of the Diocese, the Bishop having just before opened Archdeacon Thomas's Mission Chapel, and the new chapel at Mowbray. The Bishop's Journal contains many interesting details of his visits to Erste River, Caledon, Bredasdorp, Port Beaufort, &c., where the drought had been most severe. Space does not admit of quoting these, and more or less all Visitations were like one another. At Mossel Bay the Bishop remarks:

"The coloured people contribute £80 a year to their teacher's stipend. A fact like this is as good an answer as one can well give to the sneers of unbelieving lecturers before Anthropological Societies. People do not pay for that which they do not highly value, and sacrifices made for a series of years to maintain the public worship of God among a people are no bad evidence of the progress of religion among that people." At George the Bishop was presented with an address signed by all the Church laymen of the place, expressing their entire conviction of the necessity of the course he had pursued towards Dr. Colenso.

"We esteem it no shame," they said, "to own ourselves incompetent judges of the merits of many of the so-called critical questions raised by Dr. Colenso;—but we do consider ourselves competent judges of a plain moral obligation, and of the value of an oath; and measured by these tests, coupled with his own repeated avowals of opinion, we consider that Dr. Colenso has no alternative, as he would deserve the name of an honest man, but to retire from the position of a Bishop of the English Church. We further take this opportunity of declaring our fixed determination, by the help of God, to live and die in the Christian faith, as the Church has already declared the same. We would add that it has been a great encouragement to us to know that we may rely on the sym-

pathy of the Church of England, so far as that sympathy can be assured to us by the vote of the Synod of the Province of Canterbury, and the hearty concurrence of its venerable Primate."

From George the Bishop went on to Schoonberg, where the little church of "S. John in the Wilderness" was the only church within a distance of 150 miles;—to Newhaven, where, among other candidates, the Bishop confirmed the sexton, a coloured man brought up as a Mahometan. A fortnight was spent in the Knysna. Going to Plettenburg Bay, he overtook an old couple of eighty and eighty-two respectively, who had walked four miles to be present at the services held there. Then came the Karroo, which the Bishop used to say was always the most trying part of a Visitation both to man and beast. Mrs. Gray, in a letter to her son, gives a vivid description of its discomforts. Bad slippery roads, and steep hills, much walking and little to eat, are recorded; and then "we got into wretched, ugly, dry Karroo country, and had our hardest work.[1] Between that and Beaufort, eighteen hours, there was only one house, and that of the most wretched description, a very poor barn. We were directed to another, where forage was sent to meet us, but we knew only its name, and did not know that it was off the main road. The only people we could ask all day were 'trek boers,' people living in wagons and tents, leading a nomad life with their sheep and goats, along the banks of a half-dry river, camping wherever there was a hole with water in it. These did not know the house we were to go to, though they knew a 'koppie' of the same name, and told us we should see it from a distance, and that we had only

[1] The Bishop writes, Beaufort, October 3rd, 1865:

"My dearest boy—I must write you a few lines on the day on which I complete my fifty-sixth year. We arrived here on Friday, your mother being very unwell from the fatigues of the journey across the Karroo. . . One night the horses had to stand out, and would have had no forage, had not an old dying Boer told me that there was a sack lying over his head, which had been left there all last year, belonging to a gentleman here whom I know. I pounced upon it as if it had been Elijah's ravens. . . I had laid in two chickens, which turned out to be antediluvians and half raw. We could neither cut them nor tear them, so went without supper!"

to follow the spoor of some carts which were gone to the house. We did so, and thereby missed it, and went on and on with no water, or change from the dreary desert, till eight o'clock at night, luckily moonlight, when we came to the one hovel on the high road, after eleven hours' driving. We then had trouble to get forage,—there was no stable,—and we stood about till after ten, and spent the rest of the night sitting in the cart. I unfortunately caught cold and got a sore throat. . . After that we went on to Victoria—fifteen hours of Karroo. . . For three weeks in the Karroo we did not see a blade of grass, hardly any running water, and even the bushes without a leaf or green twig for days together. The air is so dry that everything warps and crackles, and, of course, everything is full of dust."

The Bishop also writes from

"George, October 20th, 1865.

"We have at last got out of the Karroo, where we have had a rough time of it. Your mother is gradually recovering her strength, which was reduced by hard work. We did full 75 miles in one day, with little food for man or beast. The horses are in first-rate condition, and always equal to an unexpected pressure. . . . I am very sorry for Gladstone's ejection, and should have voted for him if I could. I do not agree in his Church line, but I think him both honest and earnest, and in a Colony we learn to wish that the Church were not established, believing that the truth and the cause of our Lord suffer thereby. . . . We start again to-morrow. We are very uneasy and restless about getting on, and we twit each other about getting old!"

For some time past allusions have appeared in letters to Dr. Williamson's failing health; and that Bishop Gray fully realised the parting that was at hand, will be seen from the following letter written to his brother-in-law himself:—

"August 16th, 1865.

"My dear Richard—I write you a few lines after a long day, on the eve of my departure, being much grieved at the

accounts just received of your difficulty in breathing, and great weakness. It may be, my dear brother, that the Master is calling you home, when we had fondly hoped to see you and hear you yet again, holding forth the Word of Life, in that house which you have restored in some measure to its former beauty. If this be so, you will be the first to say, 'It is the Lord, let Him do what seemeth Him good.' And dearest Annie will bow in meek submission, though you will know with a heart how near to breaking. I have clung to the idea of your sudden recovery as long as I dared. I fear that I must give up the hope, though I will yet trust and pray that you may have relief. May God comfort, support, bless you both. It is something to be able to look forward to the future as you can do, with calm confidence, and the blessed assurance of a glorious immortality. May we meet in a brighter and happier world, if we meet no more here. I have yet to struggle in the trenches, or, like the builders of the temple, to fight with one hand, while seeking to lay the foundations of God's house with the other. At times I too feel as if the system was giving way, but then again there comes renewed vigour. When the end comes may my hope be clear and bright as I believe yours is. We start early in the morning, and I have yet much to do.—Believe me ever your affectionate brother,

"R. CAPETOWN."

The same inclosure bore a few loving words to his sister:

"My dearest Annie—Your note just received filled me with much pain, more for you than for dear Richard. The distress of looking upon one so dear drawing each breath with pain, and the thought that the slight disease was daily assuming a more formidable appearance, must have been very trying. But then you have ever lived in the Presence of God, and know that beneath you are the Everlasting Arms. Perfect love casteth out fear and speaks inward peace, and I am much mistaken if you are not feeling sweetest consolation as you look calmly to the future. There is before you both the assurance

that you shall see your Lord's Face in glory, and be made partakers in the fulness of the blessing of the redemption which He hath wrought. How very soon you will both share in the rest that shall never end! My heart and thoughts will be much with you both, and my prayers be offered for you. It may be our Father's purpose to spare your dear one a little longer or to take him away. While spared I trust that his sufferings will not be great. What a marvellous way does God work in! All that we have been mourning over in the silence of the last two years, has been His method of disciplining and training a soul for His Kingdom. My dearest Annie, I trust too that all is being blessed to you, and aiding in perfecting you for the life that shall know no end."

It was on the Bishop's return that he was met first by tidings of increased danger, and then of the earthly close of his brother's life.

On September 11th, 1865, Dr. Williamson died at the age of 62, and in him the Bishop lost not only an affectionate brother-in-law, but an unvaryingly wise and faithful counsellor, whose opinion and judgment had been a stay to him through all his toilsome and troubled episcopate. The final tidings reached him through the newspapers while on his way back to Cape Town. The Bishop writes

To Edward Gray, Esq.

"George, October 20th, 1865.

"Your account of dear Richard is very sad. Poor dear Annie! . . . Do not make yourself uneasy about me and Colenso. My course is clear. A necessity is laid upon me to defend our Lord's Cause, and purge the Church of all complicity, and woe is me if I shrink! I long for rest, and time for other things, but I must not be like our Boers in the Free State, who have gone back to their farms without taking Moshesh in his mountain, because they are tired of the war! I am sending home to Bullock for publication an appeal for men for Natal. . . . The time of trial for the poor Clergy of Natal is just approaching."

To the Rev. the Hon. HENRY DOUGLAS.

"Mossel Bay, October 22nd, 1865.

"My dear Douglas—I need not say how grateful I feel for the interest you take in me. As to the costs of the two trials, my brother has informed me that they are all paid, amounting, I believe, to £2500. The costs in the matter of Colenso out here have been small. My worthy registrar, a solicitor, has declined to receive remuneration for his services, and I have only paid sums which are not worth naming. My expenses at or about Natal have been £200, but I should decline to be repaid these. [Then follow sundry items to be repaid to other persons.] I should be glad to see these paid, and I gather from my brother that there are sufficient funds in hand to do so. . . . As to the address, I do not think it is needed. It lowers the Church to praise one of her sons for simply discharging a plain duty. I *could* not have acted otherwise than I have done. I should have been a traitor if I had. I would rather that all this was taken as a matter of course. What I am really anxious for is an entire repudiation of communion with Dr. Colenso on the part of the Church. The resolution of Convocation almost amounts to this, and is very valuable. It has done great good here. I suppose where Synods are in operation, acts of Synods have a greater weight than people in England generally attach to them. At all events, *I* feel great encouragement from them. Colenso's aim is to make what has passed appear to be a mere dispute between himself and us here. He tries to separate me from others, and attributes all to my ambition, and desire to separate this Church from the Church of England. He says that he is a Bishop of the Church of England, and I the self-chosen Pope of the Church of South Africa. For myself I know you at least will believe that I care nothing. Addresses making it out that I have done some great thing are really to me painful and humiliating. . . . Whatever funds over and above *legal* expenses may be placed at my disposal, will be devoted to the work of the Church, chiefly perhaps the Sustentation Fund. This country is in a

that you shall see your Lord's Face in glory, and be made partakers in the fulness of the blessing of the redemption which He hath wrought. How very soon you will both share in the rest that shall never end! My heart and thoughts will be much with you both, and my prayers be offered for you. It may be our Father's purpose to spare your dear one a little longer or to take him away. While spared I trust that his sufferings will not be great. What a marvellous way does God work in! All that we have been mourning over in the silence of the last two years, has been His method of disciplining and training a soul for His Kingdom. My dearest Annie, I trust too that all is being blessed to you, and aiding in perfecting you for the life that shall know no end."

It was on the Bishop's return that he was met first by tidings of increased danger, and then of the earthly close of his brother's life.

On September 11th, 1865, Dr. Williamson died at the age of 62, and in him the Bishop lost not only an affectionate brother-in-law, but an unvaryingly wise and faithful counsellor, whose opinion and judgment had been a stay to him through all his toilsome and troubled episcopate. The final tidings reached him through the newspapers while on his way back to Cape Town. The Bishop writes

To Edward Gray, Esq.

"George, October 20th, 1865.

"Your account of dear Richard is very sad. Poor dear Annie! . . . Do not make yourself uneasy about me and Colenso. My course is clear. A necessity is laid upon me to defend our Lord's Cause, and purge the Church of all complicity, and woe is me if I shrink! I long for rest, and time for other things, but I must not be like our Boers in the Free State, who have gone back to their farms without taking Moshesh in his mountain, because they are tired of the war! I am sending home to Bullock for publication an appeal for men for Natal. . . . The time of trial for the poor Clergy of Natal is just approaching."

To the Rev. the Hon. HENRY DOUGLAS.

"Mossel Bay, October 22nd, 1865.

"My dear Douglas—I need not say how grateful I feel for the interest you take in me. As to the costs of the two trials, my brother has informed me that they are all paid, amounting, I believe, to £2500. The costs in the matter of Colenso out here have been small. My worthy registrar, a solicitor, has declined to receive remuneration for his services, and I have only paid sums which are not worth naming. My expenses at or about Natal have been £200, but I should decline to be repaid these. [Then follow sundry items to be repaid to other persons.] I should be glad to see these paid, and I gather from my brother that there are sufficient funds in hand to do so. . . . As to the address, I do not think it is needed. It lowers the Church to praise one of her sons for simply discharging a plain duty. I *could* not have acted otherwise than I have done. I should have been a traitor if I had. I would rather that all this was taken as a matter of course. What I am really anxious for is an entire repudiation of communion with Dr. Colenso on the part of the Church. The resolution of Convocation almost amounts to this, and is very valuable. It has done great good here. I suppose where Synods are in operation, acts of Synods have a greater weight than people in England generally attach to them. At all events, *I* feel great encouragement from them. Colenso's aim is to make what has passed appear to be a mere dispute between himself and us here. He tries to separate me from others, and attributes all to my ambition, and desire to separate this Church from the Church of England. He says that he is a Bishop of the Church of England, and I the self-chosen Pope of the Church of South Africa. For myself I know you at least will believe that I care nothing. Addresses making it out that I have done some great thing are really to me painful and humiliating. . . . Whatever funds over and above *legal* expenses may be placed at my disposal, will be devoted to the work of the Church, chiefly perhaps the Sustentation Fund. This country is in a

miserable condition through successive years of drought. The clergy consequently suffer, for in many places the people have almost nothing to eat. At such a time my ecclesiastical income is stopped by the Colonial Bishops' Council, to make their case the stronger against Colenso; and to my dismay S. P. G. has reduced our grants instead of increasing them as Bullock informed me they intended to do. . . . I have been obliged to take up four new works since I have been out. It is impossible not to do such things. Whenever I have shrunk because I did not see my way clearly, I have always regretted it."

To his sister he wrote in all the warmth of his tender heart (Mossel Bay, October 22nd), earnestly commending her to God's gracious care, and touchingly telling her how he had remembered her in the Litany when offering the prayer for "widows," as also in the Holy Eucharist, and how, while preaching upon the words "O grave, where is thy victory?" he had her and her husband in his mind.

His letters are full of simple, unforced, loving consolations, lingering wistfully as it were over the peaceful thoughts of a holy death, from which he was constrained to turn to the uneasy turmoil of life in which it was God's Will for himself to be yet awhile plunged. He writes to his brother:

To Edward Gray, Esq.

"Bishop's Court, November 18th, 1865.

"I heard of dear Richard's death through the *Times*. I have since had dearest Annie's calm though broken description of his last hours. I hope that she may live near you and dear Essex, and find some little employment among the poor. It would, I think, be the best thing for her. We reached home, thank God, in safety, last week. I cannot be too thankful for God's great mercies and blessings of a temporal kind. The children are good, dutiful, loving. Amidst a troubled life I have had unbounded family blessings.

"I suppose by this time Colenso has landed, and the fight begun. I am told that very few Churchmen will ally them-

selves with him. He is greeted by a knot of Dissenters and Socinians. The Dean tells me that Churchmen are drawing more and more together for resistance; they have their protests ready. . . . I look with great anxiety to the next two months in Natal. Cardwell endeavoured to induce Stephens, Colenso's counsel, to come out here as Attorney-General. . . . The Archbishop's firmness has defeated Cardwell's intended Government Bill, which was to bring us under the Privy Council. I heard of it accidentally, and wrote to protest. It would promote scepticism and do much harm. I meet my Dean and Chapter next week, to consult with them among other things (as, *e.g.*, our standard for examination for Holy Orders), upon the course to be pursued by me in organising the Province, and the act and form of excommunication. The one chief question as to organisation is as to whether we shall admit the laity to our Provincial Synod. There is a wide difference of opinion on the subject, which hampers my action. . . . O that I could have a little breathing time here, to read our great Commentaries on the Word of God, and write sermons; but it may not be. If the Archbishop will approve of a man for Natal, chosen by S Oxon. and the Bishop of Graham's Town, I see no grounds for my leaving Africa."

There was much to keep the Bishop at home,—for Africa had indeed become *Home* to him. The distress, owing to drought, famine, and difficulties in the money market, was very great, to say nothing of ecclesiastical troubles. Hundreds of able-bodied labourers were unemployed, and the lack of good understanding between the Legislative and Executive authorities made it very difficult to apply comprehensive remedies. The present distress was so urgent, that, after consultation with the Roman Catholic Bishop and the Moderator of the Dutch Church, the Metropolitan proposed to the Governor that a day of solemn fasting and humiliation should be appointed, and the 12th January, 1866, was accordingly appointed.

Writing at this time to Mr. Douglas, the Bishop says: "You will remember, my dear fellow, that I want no addresses to myself, no money for myself. Whatever comes, be it much

or little, will all be given to the Church, especially to the Sustentation Fund. There are many works I would undertake, if I had the means. One I have much at heart is the establishment, not of a College, but say a Hall, for the Education of Candidates for Holy Orders. We have a good many young fellows who would be glad to have a training beyond what we can give them in existing institutions. But I must postpone this till I see the Sustentation Fund in a better position. . . . My late Visitation was the saddest one I have ever made. There is a cry of distress from one end of the country to the other. I took the chair last week at a public meeting at Cape Town, in behalf of the unemployed." . . .

But before that, the Natal struggle, to which Bishop Gray had looked forward as inevitable, began. It will be remembered that an important meeting or conference had been held at Natal on S. Peter's Day, from which certain questions were put to the African Bishops as to the present distress. The Metropolitan had replied at once; and on November 4th the Bishop of Graham's Town's answer was published in the *Natal Mercury*. The Bishop of the Free State had not sent a formal reply, but expressed his opinion that to join Dr. Colenso would be to separate from the Communion of the Church of England, and that another Bishop must be elected. The Bishop of S. Helena had gone to Ascension for his health, and his reply had not been received. The Bishop of Graham's Town's letter was as follows:—

"Brighton, September 7th, 1865.

"My dear Lord—In regard to the question respecting which the Clergy and Laity of Natal wish the Bishops of South Africa to be consulted, it appears to me that the following considerations are important:—

"I. It is asked whether the acceptance of a new Bishop would in any way sever the Clergy and Laity from the Mother Church in England. To this question I would reply, first, That it seems to me that it would be a virtual act of separation from the Church for them to admit any Episcopal authority of Bishop Colenso over them. For while his letters patent give

him a certain titular status, from which it appears he cannot be removed, except through a judicial process, of that which these letters patent professed to confer, but which they had no power by law to confer,—authority over his Clergy, as Bishop of the Diocese, he has been deprived by a process in accordance with the letters patent,—with the principles on which, in the Church of England, a Bishop who should offend the laws of the Church would be deprived,—and with the oath of canonical obedience to the Metropolitan See of Cape Town, which he took at the time of his consecration by the Archbishop of Canterbury. If he were to be allowed to have still Episcopal authority in the diocese of Natal, it would be, as it seems to me, in direct opposition to the conditions under which the Church of England sent him forth as Bishop of Natal. That this view is recognised by the Church of England is sufficiently apparent from the fact, that in England itself he is inhibited from exercising any functions of his office. Again, as Bishop Colenso is not any longer Bishop of the Diocese of Natal, although by law he retains the title, it is perfectly competent for those to whom the duty may belong to appoint a new Bishop to the Diocese; and this Bishop, if appointed in accordance with principles sanctioned by the Church of England, it will be the manifest duty of the Clergy and Laity of the Diocese of Natal to accept as having authority over them.

"It is not so easy, as it seems to me, to give a conclusive reply to the second question,—viz. What are the proper steps for them to take to obtain a new Bishop? because no principles, universally applicable, as to the appointment to vacant Bishoprics, have been recognised by the Church of England. Any right on the part of the Crown to appoint, in those countries in which the Sovereign cannot confer jurisdiction, will certainly no longer be claimed. Indeed, for some time the Crown has ceased, in some Colonies, to nominate the Bishops. In Canada, appointments made by the Clergy and Laity of a Diocese, and confirmed by the Bishop of the Province, who consecrated the new Bishop without any letters patent from the Crown, have been for the last few years recog-

nised by all authorities both in the Church and State in England.

"I conceive therefore that, if the majority of the Clergy and representatives of the Laity, in the Diocese of Natal, will agree with the Metropolitan and majority of the Bishops of the Province in selecting and nominating some one to be a new Bishop of that Diocese, he will be the Bishop of that Diocese when he is consecrated, on principles already sanctioned by the Church of England.—Believe me, yours very faithfully,

"H. GRAHAMSTOWN."

A very short time later the Archbishop of Canterbury's answer to the same questions was received by the Dean of Maritzburg, and it was a document of great importance and value at that critical conjuncture, as will be seen.

"Addington Park, Croydon, October 8th, 1865.

"My dear Dean—On my return from a short tour on the Continent, I found your letter of August 1st, accompanied by the Resolutions agreed upon at the meeting of the Clergy and representatives of the lay communicants of the Diocese of Natal in the Cathedral on S. Peter's Day. The Bishop of Cape Town has sent me his answers to the questions put to him by the assembled Clergy and Laity at Maritzburg, and I consider them to be judicious. I do not see how you can accept Dr. Colenso as your Bishop without identifying yourself with his errors. The Bishops of the Church of England, I believe with scarcely an exception, have either publicly prohibited Dr. Colenso from preaching in their Dioceses, or have intimated their unwillingness to permit him to do so. At any rate, he has not, so far as I am aware, preached in any Diocese, except on one occasion, so that the great majority of the Bishops have withdrawn all communication with him. As to the appointment of a Bishop of Natal, the Church in South Africa has been pronounced by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council to be just as independent as any of the Nonconformist communities, and under this view is, I conclude, competent to elect its own

Bishop without reference to the authorities in England, either civil or ecclesiastical; nor, as I conceive, will such an act separate you from communion with the Church of England. The Scotch Episcopal Church is in communion with us, but elects its own Bishops, and is not obliged to submit to appeals to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. May the Lord bless and guide yourself and the Church of Natal under your present trials. Believe me, dear Mr. Dean, yours very faithfully,

C. T. CANTUAR."

The Archbishop's opinion, as well as that of the whole Church, was of course perfectly known to Dr. Colenso, but nevertheless that most unfortunate person returned to the country where nothing was so much desired as his absence. He landed at D'Urban on November 6th, and was received, not indeed by the Clergy or communicants of the place, but by a mixed assembly of the indifferent or godless inhabitants, with a sprinkling of dissenters, of whom, however, the really conscientious were as much revolted against the false teaching of the former Bishop as any. Dr. Colenso put forth his ecclesiastical views, in reply to his meagre train of admirers, in language which, while sufficiently describing his own mind and position, was not likely to win Church people to sympathise with him. His one object of Divine worship and right seemingly was the State and its High Priest—the Privy Council. "We" (did he mean the dissenters and unbelievers in his suite, and if not, who?) "have made choice to be bound by her (the Church of England) laws, to submit to the decisions of her chief tribunals, to the interpretations that may be put upon her formularies by her Supreme Courts of Appeal. We have agreed also to recognise this grand foundation of the Church of England, that the Queen—not the Archbishops and Bishops—the Queen, not of course in her personal capacity, but as representing the whole nation, the State and not the clerical body, is the one only legislator and supreme arbiter of all causes which may arise within her pale, spiritual as well as temporal; that the Archbishops and Bishops in England itself only exer-

cise jurisdiction in the Church as it is delegated to them from the Crown, and hold their Courts in the Queen's name;' that all their authority, except only what comes by force of moral persuasion and convincing argument, by the power of a holy life and the influence of the truth spoken in love, emanates from the common head of the Church and State."

Strange doctrine certainly to proceed from a Bishop, and raising up some odd historical associations and trains of thought which one would have supposed might have also occurred to so well-read a person as the Cambridge Professor. Dr. Colenso did remark that some people called these principles Erastian, and thought them not only objectionable but ungodly; indeed he does not say that they are not both, but he affirms them to be the "fundamental principles of the Church of England," and on this *petitio principii* he considers that a nation growing (under such new lights) in intelligence and wisdom, will, with the scientific and theological help of Parliament, ere long alter its religious system most advantageously.

Fain would one pass over the disgraceful scenes which followed, but history imperatively requires their record, however briefly and regretfully. On the first Sunday after his arrival in Maritzburg, Dr. Colenso remained passive, and the Dean, after the early celebration, had a special penitential service, in which part of the Commination Service was used. During the week the deposed Bishop announced his intention of preaching in the Cathedral on Sunday, November 17th, and the Churchwardens accordingly sent in their protest, and made arrangements for closing the Cathedral on that day. Acting then on his view of the source whence all spiritual authority emanates, Dr. Colenso obtained an interdict from the Chief Justice (a person of his own views), late on the Saturday night, restraining the Dean and Churchwardens from closing the church; and, armed with this secular weapon, he presented himself the next morning. He was refused entrance at the vestry, but the north door was thrown open after the Churchwardens had read a protest against the interdict. Dr. Colenso and his train proceeded to the chancel, before entering which a Churchwarden again met

him, and read aloud the protest already sent to him. It was to this effect:—

"To John William Colenso, D.D., by her Majesty's letters patent Bishop of Natal. My Lord—Inasmuch as your Lordship has been deposed from the exercise of your office as Bishop of Natal, and as such sentence has been approved of by the Archbishops and Bishops of the United Church of England and Ireland, and of many other Churches throughout the world, we cannot doubt, but must and do rest fully assured, that such sentence is binding in the Sight of Almighty God. And, as the Lord Chancellor, in giving judgment on your Lordship's petition, stated that the Church of England is not a part of the constitution in any Colonial settlement, nor can its authorities, or those who bear office in it, claim to be recognised by the laws of the Colony otherwise than as members of a voluntary association, the Clergy within this Colony, with one exception, have refused to acknowledge your Lordship as their spiritual head. And as it is within our knowledge that the Congregation ordinarily worshipping in this church generally concurs with the Clergy, we, as Wardens thereof, feel bound to refuse, and hereby do refuse, your Lordship permission to exercise any spiritual function therein. Furthermore, we solemnly warn your Lordship that if, despising the sentence of the Church of Christ and this our prohibition as Wardens of the sacred building, you attempt to stand amongst us as the minister of Christ, such a proceeding can only be looked upon as an act of violence.

"C. H. DICKENSON,
"SAMUEL WILLIAMS, } *Churchwardens of S. Peter's.*"

To this protest Dr. Colenso replied—"I am come to discharge in this church and Diocese the duties committed to me by the Queen."

The Metropolitan's Registrar then read the sentence of deprivation, after which the Dean, who with another Priest was within the chancel, solemnly pronounced the words: "It is written, 'That which ye shall bind on earth is bound in heaven.' That sentence therefore stands ratified before the Throne of the Almighty. Fear God, and depart from evil."

Setting at nought the profanity of the proceeding, Dr. Colenso then went up the chancel steps, robed himself with the help of his servant, and read the Morning Service, gave out and started a hymn, after saying the Litany, and preached. The *Natal Times* observes: "Of the regular attendants at the Cathedral there were but few present. Of professing Churchmen there were undoubtedly a great number, of dissenters but a sprinkling, while the rest were made up of those who, we are bound to say, never enter a place of worship from one year's end to another. These consisted chiefly of artizans and day labourers, many of them in their fustians and corduroys, and more than one we noticed in his shirt sleeves."

Before the next Sunday, the Dean, whose line throughout was dignified and calm, made an arrangement to prevent indecent scenes while the temporal question of who had a right to the material building was still unsettled, by holding early services for the regular congregation, and leaving the Cathedral later in the day to Dr. Colenso, who happily did not presume to attempt any celebration of Holy Communion, which the true pastor alone provided for the flock.

The Metropolitan was now constrained to take the action he had always intended to take should the deposed Bishop return, and he consequently sent the following letter to Dr. Colenso:—

"Bishop's Court, December 13th, 1865.

"My Lord—The time has, alas! arrived when, in accordance with the following resolution, unanimously adopted by the Synod of Bishops of this Province, I am bound, after due and repeated admonition, to separate you by formal sentence from the Communion of the Church:—

"'This Synod is of opinion that should the Bishop of Natal presume to exercise Episcopal functions in the Diocese of Natal, after the sentence of the Metropolitan shall have been notified to him, without an appeal to Canterbury, and without being restored to his office by the Metropolitan, he will be, *ipso facto*, excommunicated; and that it will be the duty of the Metropolitan, after due admonition, to pronounce the formal sentence

of excommunication. Before taking this last step thus enjoined upon me, which I am sure you will do me the justice to believe must be on every ground a most painful one, I desire to express my readiness to adopt any of the following courses, which, if assented to by you, may enable me to escape it.

"I will submit both the judgment and the sentence which I have pronounced upon the charges brought against you, and which have been agreed to by the other Bishops of this Province, for final adjudication, either, 1st, To his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, to be heard by him with the assistance of such Bishops of his Province as he may see fit to summon. I put this prominently forward, because it seems to have been the course decided on by the Crown and the Church at the foundation of the See, and marked out in the letters patent; or, 2nd, To a Synod, or other gathering of the Bishops of England, or of the United Church; or, 3rd, To a Synod, or other gathering of such of the Bishops of our Communion throughout the Empire as can be assembled in London for the hearing of the case upon the invitation of his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury; and I will use earnest endeavours to obtain a hearing of the case at the earliest possible period by whichever tribunal you may prefer.

"I cannot consent to submit my sentence to any other body except the Bishops of the Church,—1st, Because I believe that they are the only persons who by the Word of God and the Canons of the Church are competent to set it aside; 2nd, Because it is expressly provided in the letters patent founding the several Sees of the Province, that the gravest spiritual causes in this portion of the Church shall be finally decided by Bishops only; 3rd, Because there is no law, either of the Church or of the State, which empowers Her Majesty, either in person or by deputy, to hear and decide spiritual causes for Colonial Churches, which are declared to be purely voluntary associations.

"Should you within a week from the receipt of this letter signify your readiness to the Dean of Maritzburg to abide by

the decision of any of the parties whom I have named, he will stay the issue of the sentence. But if not, he will, under my instructions, publish without further reference to me the last sad formal document.—I remain, with the deepest pain and sorrow, your faithful servant, R. CAPETOWN, *Metropolitan.*"

Let those who listened for a moment to the most unjust and false imputations of harshness and personal feeling laid against the Metropolitan by Dr. Colenso and his few adherents,[1] read, together with this official document, a private letter sent with it, of so touching a character that one would almost shrink from publishing it, had not Dr. Colenso—seemingly blind to the strong witness it bears against himself—seen fit to do so already.

"As the time draws near," it says, "in which I feel that I must take the most painful step I have ever taken in my life, my heart yearns over you; and I make this last, I fear ineffectual, attempt to lead you to adopt one or other of the only two courses which can spare us both the pain and distress of a formal severance. My own feeling, since you entered upon the course which you have of late followed—and I think at first your own also—has been that, having conscientiously departed from the Faith of the Church of England, the true line for you, as a religious-minded man, was openly to admit this, and retire from a post which not only implied that you held that Faith, but required you to see that others under you taught it. I think you must be conscious that you do not believe what the Church teaches. If you really held what it holds, you would, I am persuaded, have been shocked and deeply pained at what has been said of your supposed views, and at your having given any

[1] Instances of the consideration and forbearance continually shown to Dr. Colenso might be multiplied from his letters were it desirable,—his sensitive delicacy in avoiding whatever might run the risk of paining one whom he had rejoiced to call his friend, and his characteristic desire to do nothing, as he says in a letter to the Bishop of Oxford, "which, were I in his place, I should feel indignant at." The Metropolitan carried this watchful consideration so far as to refuse to take measures pressed upon him by the dearest of all his friends, Bishop Wilberforce, fearing that they might in any way annoy the Bishop of Natal.

just ground for the imputations cast upon you; and you would have at once eagerly pointed out that you had been misunderstood, misrepresented, and have declared what your real convictions were, and given to the world a full confession of your faith. You have not done this, and it leaves the impression on my mind that you know and feel that, on the very gravest subjects and doctrines, you differ from the Church. If so, surely you ought, as a true man, to say so, and save us all the pain, anxiety, and many troubles which your not saying so is entailing. Unless you are very much changed from what you were while we had free, confidential, and loving intercourse with each other, you will not be content to hold on to your position and endowments upon the miserable plea that the measure of the legal is the measure of the moral obligation.

"But if your own judgment leads you to think that you have not departed from the truths which you have undertaken to teach, ought not the general voice of the Church on this matter to convince you? That voice has been, I need scarce tell you, clearly expressed, not in England only, but by the Synods of many Colonial Churches, and of the Church in Scotland, and, as you will learn by this mail, by the unanimous vote of the first Provincial Synod of Canada, and the equally unanimous vote of the General Convention of the Church in America, which is one in faith with ourselves. These conclusions are in each place the act of the whole Church, consisting of Bishops, Clergy, and Laity. As then, through a great many constitutional organs, the Churches of our Communion throughout the world have spoken with one voice, ought you not to 'hear the Church,' and cease to trouble and disturb its peace by withdrawing of your own accord to lay communion?

"But if you are not prepared for this, and think that it is through misapprehension that the Church has denounced your teaching, a door is still open to you. You can plead your opinions or explain your views, if you so will, before the nearest approach to a National Synod which we can obtain, and after striving to show their conformity with its Faith, leave

yourself in its hands. Such a Synod has been asked for by the Province of Canada and by myself very earnestly. To the decision of such a body I will cheerfully refer everything. To Civil Judges you know that I could not, as a matter of conscience, refer the decision of a spiritual question. Consider, I pray you, what must be the result of your refusing this, and forcing yourself upon the Church.

"First, I shall have no option left but to carry out the decision of the Synod of this Province, and separate you, by open sentence, from the communion of the Church; and that separation will, I have no doubt, be formally recognised by the English Church, and by all the Churches of our Communion throughout the world. I have, indeed, as you will learn by this mail, given conditional instructions on this subject. It is the pain which the contemplation of this step causes me that induces me to write this letter; of which you will not, I believe, misinterpret the motive. Believe me I shall not, without deep distress, do what I seem driven to do.

"Next, the Church will send out and consecrate another pastor. Steps are being taken with a view to this, and funds, I am assured, will not be wanting. Suppose the law were to give you the endowment obtained by me for far other teaching than yours, or that it were even to give you the possession of the churches, I am sure that you know enough to feel well satisfied that, as of old, men would be prepared to worship anywhere, even, if need be, in the dens and caves of the earth, till they could erect other churches, sooner than abandon themselves to the teaching of what they believe to be another Gospel. Think what your position would then be. You know that all earnestness and all deep religious conviction would be against you, and that you could only trouble the flock of Christ around you, and keep up a schism, for a few years.

"I think that your heart must recoil from the strife and confusion you have already occasioned. Build up the Church in Natal in one communion *you* never can. Another may do this; you can only weaken and disturb. With this letter,

intended to be private, you will receive my official letter through the Dean. About my own feelings, and the way in which you have, I hope unintentionally, done me wrong, I say nothing.—With very deep sorrow that we should ever have been brought into the relationship in which we now stand to each other, I am truly yours, R. CAPETOWN."

This earnest appeal met with its answer in a pamphlet, of which the less said the better for the writer.

There was no lack of representations and efforts on all sides to induce Dr. Colenso to lay aside his unhappy rebellion against the Church. The Clergy protested anew; and the proceedings of the American Convention (of which the Bishop of Maryland (Dr. Whittingham) was mouthpiece, and of the Provincial Synod of Canada (whose emphatic denunciation of Dr. Colenso's "heretical and false doctrine" was forwarded through the Bishop of Montreal (Dr. Fulford), might have carried some weight.

Dr. Colenso did, apparently, feel the Archbishop's letter to the Dean as a heavy blow, but it roused anger, not repentance, and he wrote a bitter remonstrance, in which he informed the Archbishop that he "had a right to ask him to point out his errors, though he ventured to believe his Grace would not be able to point out any making him amenable to law," and concluding with the assurance that *he* thought it no evil, but a great advantage, to be subject to "the Supreme Court of Appeal, and thereby to be saved from arbitrary and prejudiced proceedings of irresponsible ecclesiastical judges."

All who knew and loved the late gentle, courteous Archbishop Longley will realise that he felt strongly when he wrote the subjoined reply:—

"Lambeth Palace, February 10th, 1866.

"My Lord—I have duly received your letter of November 30th, containing a complaint of a wrong you imagine I have done you by a letter I wrote to the Dean of Maritzburg. In

answer to this charge I have no hesitation in avowing that, according to my belief, you have been duly and canonically deposed from your spiritual office, according to the common law of the Church of Christ as set forth in the concluding paragraph of the 26th Article of the Church of England, and I must decline to hold myself responsible to you for entertaining such a belief. I have never obtruded this opinion on others in my capacity as Primate of the United Church of England and Ireland, but I have not hesitated to avow my private opinion when it has been sought for; nor when my counsel was asked by those who were in doubt and difficulty did I shrink from imparting it. I never expected that my letter would have been given to the public; but as those to whom I addressed it have thought fit to publish a portion of it, I do not disavow the sentiment therein expressed. At any rate I could not have objected to the course they thus took from any apprehension that I might be called one day to sit as a judge in your case, because I have high legal authority for saying that there appears to be no mode of proceeding by which I could be called upon to act in that capacity. The censure, therefore, which you would impute to me on this ground proves to be entirely without foundation. As you ask me to point out the errors to which I have alluded, I have merely to refer you to the reasons for your deposition, as stated in the judgment of deprivation passed upon you, and to state my belief that for such errors in doctrine an English Clergyman would have been ejected from his cure.

"No one can more deeply deplore than I do the present unhappy condition of the Diocese of Natal;—but let God be the Judge with whom rests the responsibility of this lamentable division in a regularly constituted branch of the Church of Christ. May it please Him to guide into the way of truth all such as have erred and are deceived, and to restore peace where there is now, to our great sorrow, discord and dissension. —I am, my Lord, your faithful and obedient servant,

"C. T. CANTUAR."

The unhappy state of the Diocese and its needs were plainly put forth in the *Anglo-African* of December 7th, where it is said:

"As the case now stands, here is one of the Dioceses of, we will say the English Church, with a Bishop in its midst who has been forbidden to officiate in all the Dioceses of England, because of the unsoundness of his teaching; who has been formally deposed from the exercise of his office by the Metropolitan of the Province to whom he had sworn allegiance, a Bishop whose Clergy, almost to a man, repudiate his authority, and who only claims to be a Bishop *in* the Diocese, for he cannot say Bishop *of* the Diocese after the recent judgment. . . . . And yet we have this Bishop claiming to be the representative of the Church which has repudiated his teaching, and seemingly intimating that a refusal to acknowledge him is to be guilty of schism, and that he and his adherents only are to be looked upon as the true representatives of the Church of England in Natal."

The Metropolitan wrote to the Bishop of Graham's Town:

"Bishop's Court, January 13th, 1866.

. . . "Colenso has published my private letter to him, and a long reply full of mis-statements and offensive remarks. I have written officially to the Archbishop to repudiate his statements as to myself, but I will not (if I can help it) get into public controversy with him, and reduce this great cause, as he is striving to force me to do, to the level of a personal quarrel. I hope you also will take no notice of his personalities. . . . The Dean writes me word that he should publish the sentence last Sunday. He writes cheerfully about the issue, but he sees chiefly the state of things in the capital. It is worse at D'Urban. But Calloway writes also cheerfully about the laity's resistance to Colenso; only he says they are thoroughly Erastian, and have listened to Colenso's imputations of our intentions being to overthrow Protestant principles. The Dean says the sentence will arouse bad feeling and cause excitement

for a time, but that the Church people have been looking for it, and complaining of hesitation. However, the deed is done, God knows, very reluctantly, and with much sorrow of heart."

In a letter of the same date to her son, Mrs. Gray says: "Dean Green shrinks from hastening on any suit before the unjust lawyers . . or rather, while flesh and blood get impatient and long to do something, he feels deliberately that 'in quietness and confidence shall be his strength.' . . . Your father wrote Dr. Colenso a private letter last mail, urging him to consider once more before his excommunication. He publishes it and answers it in a pamphlet! I am sorry it was sent, but your father was so unhappy at this last step that he was anxious to try it."

But the last step had to be taken, and on Sunday, January 5th, 1866, the Dean publicly read the sentence of excommunication at the early service in the cathedral of Maritzburg.

"In the name of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, We, Robert, by divine permission, Metropolitan of the Church in the Province of Cape Town, in accordance with the decision of the Bishops of the Province in Synod assembled, do hereby, it being our office and our grief to do so, by the authority of Christ committed unto us, pass upon John William Colenso, D.D., the sentence of the greater excommunication, thereby separating him from the Communion of the Church of Christ, so long as he shall obstinately and impenitently persist in his heresy, and claim to exercise the office of a Bishop within the Province of Cape Town. And we do hereby make known to the faithful in Christ, that, being thus excluded from all communion with the Church, he is, according to our Lord's command, and in conformity with the provisions of the Thirty-third of the Articles of Religion, 'to be taken of the whole multitude of the faithful as a heathen man and a publican' (Matthew xviii. 17, 18). Given under our hand and seal this 16th day of December, 1865.

R. CAPETOWN."

At the same time the Metropolitan published a pastoral to

the Clergy and Laity of Natal, explaining clearly the reasons which forced this painful measure upon him and his Comprovincials.

"The heresies into which Dr. Colenso has fallen are no light or common errors. They touch the very life and being of the Christian Church, overthrow the faith of Christendom. It is not merely the distinctive teaching of the Church of England that he has impugned. He has assailed those fundamental truths of our common Christianity, which are equally cherished by the Churches of the East and the West, and by every sect and denomination of Protestant Christians. It is with Christianity itself, as a revelation from God, that he is at war."

After briefly recapitulating the proofs of this, the Metropolitan goes on to say:

"It was for this teaching that, after having been summoned to resign his See by the whole Episcopate of England, as well as by the Clergy of your Diocese, he was deposed from his office by the united voice of all the Bishops of this Province, including the one who could not be present at the trial. . . And it was for this teaching that it was declared by the Synod of the Province that he must be separated from the communion of the Church if he should venture to assume government over the Church of God without being restored to his office by the Archbishop of Canterbury or the Metropolitan. He has done this in spite of repeated warnings, entreaties, and protests, and no option is left to me but to carry out the resolution of the Synod. The act is of so sad, and, so far as we are concerned, of so novel a character, that it is due to you that I should state in virtue of what authority, and in obedience to what obligations, it is done. Consider what the Church of Christ is. It is a kingdom—our Lord expressly called it such. And it is a spiritual kingdom, of which He is the Head and King. It is in the world, but not of it. He has himself ordained laws for His Kingdom, and has prescribed modes for admission into it, and exclusion from it. As He has appointed the Sacrament of Baptism to be the door of entrance into it, so He has ordained

that for grave faults there shall be, by formal sentence, exclusion from it. The power to exclude is to be within the Church herself. 'If he neglect to hear the Church, let him be to thee as a heathen man and a publican.' It is to the officers whom He has commissioned and placed within His Church, that He has entrusted the execution of its laws. They act under His Authority and by His Command. 'As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you.' 'I appoint unto you a kingdom, as My Father hath appointed unto Me.' 'Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in Heaven; whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in Heaven.' 'Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.'

"None have doubted that our Lord gave power to His Apostles to shut out from His Kingdom any who might fall away from Him, or that He pledged Himself to confirm their acts. But the Church never supposed that this office belonged only to the Twelve. S. Paul, not himself one of their number, frequently exercised it. Through him the Holy Ghost commanded Titus, Bishop of Crete, as well as the Church of Corinth, to discharge it. 'A man that is a heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject.' 'Put away from yourselves that wicked person.' In accordance with the language of Holy Scripture, the Church has ever held that its Divine Head has lodged this power in the hands of Bishops, to be used by them only as a last resource, when warnings, admonitions, and entreaties have all failed, and the sinner persists in his sin. Bishops, themselves, are no more exempt from the censures of the Church than the humblest individual within it. From the first its discipline has been applied to them in accordance with the Canons which regulate it. It has ever rested with the Bishops of a Province to put in force the discipline of the Church with regard to any other brother Bishop who might either have been betrayed into sin, or have fallen from the faith; and no power but that of a higher Synod could, or can, annul their sentence."

The Metropolitan then touched upon the course of proceedings, and the judgment which pronounced the Crown incapable

of conferring jurisdiction, reducing the Church in Natal to a voluntary association, not bound, as a necessary consequence, to accept Dr. Colenso as their Bishop.

"This decision is, of course, good in law. Whatever legal titles or powers it gives to Dr. Colenso will not be disputed. Legal coercive jurisdiction there is none, and the attempt to give it will never again be repeated. No more letters patent are to be issued, that the Churches may see that they are entirely ee to act for themselves. It is right, however, that I should say that no coercive jurisdiction was ever claimed by me. My judgment neither affected to touch the title conferred upon Dr. Colenso by the Crown, nor the salary allowed him by the Bishops of the Church of England. It affected only his spiritual office as a pastor of souls. It is because he now sets aside and despises the spiritual sentence, and openly affirms that he will preach and teach among us the heresies for which he has been condemned; and claims obedience and submission to his authority on the part of the Clergy and the whole flock, which the judgment upon which he relies gives him no right to demand and no power to enforce, that we, after repeated admonitions and earnest entreaties, are driven to take the last step that the Church enjoins us to take in such cases.

"Upon spiritual sentences or their effects the judgment does not touch: incidentally, however, it recognises the spiritual authority of the Metropolitan given by Christ through His Church. To have refused to acknowledge this would have been to persecute—to deny to the Church liberties which she enjoyed even under heathen emperors. The spiritual sentence, then, of the Church remains just where it did. All that has been decided is a point of law. With the spiritual powers, rights, office of the different orders in the Church, the law has no concern, and does not claim to interfere.

"Though I have ever respected, as I was bound to do, the Queen's letters patent, framed and prepared by the highest law officers of the Crown, and bearing the signature of my Sovereign, and in all my proceedings have endeavoured to act in strict accordance with their provisions, I have never believed, or

acted as if I believed, that my authority was derived from them. I have ever held that my commission was given to me from Christ through His Church. The Church, in her Lord's Name, entrusted me with spiritual power. The Crown sought, but it seems sought in vain, to clothe that power with the authority of law. In its attempts to do so, it has hampered and weakened it."

The Pastoral goes on to explain fully the ecclesiastical side of the question, which has been already sufficiently dwelt upon in these pages, and proceeds to say: "The consequences of acknowledging Dr. Colenso as still in communion with the Church would be,—First, that he and all whom he might ordain and set over, whether the Missions or the English congregations of the Diocese, would be Ministers of the Church, teaching in her name, and with her authority, the very heresies which she has both here and in England condemned by her constitutional organs as destructive to the Faith and ruinous to the souls of men. She would be responsible for this, would be implicated in the guilt of his teaching, provoke the threatened chastisement (Rev. ii. 14-20), go far to unchurch herself. Next, that the poor man, the man uninstructed in the Christian Faith, knowing little of religious truth, would be misled to his soul's loss; while the more instructed and religiously disposed would abandon his Church for some other religious body where at least essential truths denied in his own communion would be taught, and the Church, having sunk into deadly heresy, would at length die out of the land. . . . Most unwillingly, and, God is our witness, with great sorrow of heart, all other means having failed, we have felt constrained, out of duty to our Lord and to the flock which He has committed to our keeping, to this last and only remaining remedy, and separate by open sentence this false teacher from the communion of the faithful. It is the method which our Lord has bid us use for the purging of His Church from the leaven of false doctrine; it is the medicine, too, which He has prescribed for the recovery of the fallen; for this cutting off from the Church is not for the destruction of our brother, but in the hope, and with the prayer, that he may

be led to repentance, and so to restoration, that 'his spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.'

"I invite you, my brethren, to join with me in daily intercession before the Throne of God, that such may be the case with regard to him who was your Bishop,—that his eyes may be opened, that he may be led back to the truth which he has forsaken, and recover his lost faith, and escape from the snare of the evil one. . . . Who shall say what the issue may be, if, while sorrowing over him who, being sent to lead you to Christ and His truth, has sought to lead you away therefrom, and refraining from his company, you yet day by day pray earnestly for his restoration? Through your prayers he may be given back to us, and we may yet rejoice over him as one who was dead and is alive again, was lost and is found. But whether this be the result or not, I must urge you, beloved brethren, patiently to endure your trial. A storm is passing over the Church, but the Lord, though to some He may appear to slumber, is in the ship. Ere long He will say to the winds and the waves, 'Peace, be still.' However threatening, then, and distressing present trials may be, be not, I pray you, 'soon shaken in mind.' Leave not your spiritual home, but gather round your Church for its protection and your safety. He Who promised to His Church that He would be with it always, is, we doubt not, with this portion of it now, and will not cease to be while it is true to Him. The very trials to which it is subjected give proof of this. Satan does not shoot out all his fiery darts against a dead and lifeless body. It is because His Church is a true witness for Christ in this land, that he thus rages against it. His malice is the token of our life. The Church's lot is to be ever militant upon earth, and this is our lot. Amid discouragements from quarters whence you might have looked for succour, and under the injury inflicted upon you and your children by the oppressive judgments of the courts of this world, look up to your Lord for help, strength, and guidance. Your cause is His Cause. He sympathises with you, sorrows in your sorrows, shares your troubles, suffers in His Members. Any wound inflicted on His Body the Church

pierces Him even. To those who persecute it He says, 'Why persecutest thou ME?' Lean then upon Him in trust and confidence, He will not fail you. In His own good time He will vindicate His cause and His Church, and the faith which is in Him. In patient perseverance possess ye your souls. 'Consider Him that endured the contradiction of sinners against Himself, lest ye be weary and faint in your minds: ye have not yet resisted unto blood, striving against sin.'"

As might have been expected, this rightful and necessary measure had no effect upon the outward conduct of the most unhappy person in question. The Metropolitan, having done his duty, felt that he had now only to leave the matter in God's Hands, and wait patiently.

Although it may contain some repetitions, we cannot refrain from giving the Bishop's letter, written concerning this matter, to Mr. Keble,—the last letter he ever addressed to that venerated friend, and one, alas! never to be answered by him to whom it was addressed.

"Bishop's Court, February 5th, 1866.

"My dear Mr. Keble—The sentence was published by the Dean in the Cathedral, after the Nicene Creed. I did not act until I felt that I could no longer keep back. Previous to taking any step, I consulted both my own Dean and Chapter and that of Natal. Each unanimously gave counsel that, under the circumstances of this case, I ought to proceed without delay. Others, too, from other Dioceses, as, *e.g.*, Archdeacon Merriman, wrote to say that hesitation would greatly disturb the minds of the Clergy and faithful laity; that some pious souls were losing confidence in the Church at seeing a Bishop proclaiming, Sunday after Sunday, deadly heresies, and discipline slumbering. What weighed most, however, with me, were these two things:—

"1. The plain instruction of our Lord, and the course pointed out in His Word. I felt that if this was not a case for open separation there could be none.

"2. The decision of our Provincial Synod unanimously agreed to, after invoking the aid and guidance of the Holy Spirit.

"Of course the sentence was preceded by formal admonitions, which were treated with marked contempt. I wrote also, publicly, offering to refer my sentence and judgment. . . . I also wrote privately, in memory of past affection, to urge him either to retire or assent to what I had proposed. He took no notice of my public letter, but published a reply to the private one, and proposed the ignoring of all past proceedings, and bringing charges against him before Dr. Lushington, with a right of appeal to Privy Council. Of course I could not have acceded to so monstrous a proposal, but before his letter reached me the Dean had published the sentence. I have heard but little since, but from what I have heard I suppose the sentence has stirred up less opposition than I could have conceived. The Dean said that Churchmen in the capital were waiting for it, and I believe it is a relief to them.

"Its effect in D'Urban I do not know. . . . I have laboured and prayed long for a faithful minister for that place. Dr. Colenso forced himself into the Cathedral, aided by his friend the Chief Justice. The Dean then fixed the hours of service at 9 and 4, leaving 11 and 6 to Dr. Colenso. The congregation went with the Dean. . . . Distaste for appeals to Civil Courts, and distrust of the fairness of their own court, which consists of judges who never go to church, has prevented any attempt to dispossess Colenso of the Cathedral, though vested in the See of Cape Town, and though no Bishop in England could do what he claims a right to do. . . . The desecration is very sad, and is much felt by the congregation, but their feeling is to bear with things as they are for the present. The Dean is really acting a confessor's part, in the very best spirit. The calmness, gentleness, trustfulness, holiness of his mind during this great trial, the burden of which falls chiefly upon him, is very remarkable. . . . We have now only to wait. We can do no more than pray the Lord of the harvest to raise up faithful labourers for that afflicted land. With the Church at home it must rest to acknowledge us, and send out one for

Bishop. I am almost afraid to write all this to you, knowing not how you and dear Mrs. Keble are. Do not trouble yourself to reply to it.[1] I should be very sorry if you did anything that might be in the least injurious to yourself. I have not yet troubled your £1000. I have been able as yet to pay out of other funds all that Natal has needed. I authorise, however, the Dean to draw upon me for what may be needed.—Ever faithfully and affectionately yours, R. CAPETOWN."

"The sentence does not seem to have roused the opposition which one might have expected" (he wrote, February 10th 1866, to his son). "Of course many of the papers find fault, but the minds of very many are relieved. Archdeacon Merriman wrote that the Clergy were perplexed, and the pious Laity losing faith. Dean Green said Churchmen generally were looking for it. A Clergyman in Natal writes me word that he has not met with one who condemned it. Colenso still continues to preach twice every Sunday in the Cathedral, but by every account, very few, not a dozen, Churchmen go near him. His congregations are made up of men of no religion, who go 'for the intellectual treat,' and to hear what will come next;—and of dissenters, who rather encourage him, and hope to make capital out of our troubles. The Dean feels the desecration of his church very much. . . . It is a great relief to me to have nothing more to do. We can but wait now for the action of the Church at home. The Synods of the Church must declare that they hold no communion with him. I have formally notified the sentence to all the Archbishops and Metropolitans of our Church, and to the Primus of Scotland and Senior Bishops of America. We are just now very short-handed as to Clergy, and I have to ride up to-morrow to Rondebosch to enable the Dean (who is with us) to have a quiet Sunday here. I take

[1] The Bishop of Cape Town's troubles lay very near Mr. Keble's heart; only a short time before his death he said, talking of them to the writer: "There is Liddon raised up to be the comforter of Pusey's old age, and Patteson of Selwyn's. I think if I could see a Liddon raised up for the dear Bishop of Cape Town, I should be content." On one occasion he told Dr. Liddon that he looked upon Capetown as the greatest of all Colonial Bishops, because he was a real confessor of the Faith.

my swim[1] every morning in a quiet way, without being tempted by young fellows like you to launch out beyond the rocks among the breakers. I have enough of these ahead, in another direction, for an old man! . . .

"February 22nd.—The Archbishop has recommended a Clergyman for election and consecration at Natal. He has also expressed his readiness to call a National Synod, if the Colonial Churches wish it. I have consequently written to nearly all the Colonial Bishops. . . . The Dean (Douglas) will probably be at home as soon as this letter. You will, I hope, see him. His is a fine mind, and a finer character."

To the Rev. the Hon. HENRY DOUGLAS.

(Not dated, but the envelope bears the date March 1866.)

"I have just seen your letter to Mr. —— and his reply. Apparently he would leave heresy and unbelief to spread as a cancer over the whole Colonial Church, until Parliament shall have legislated for us, and brought us into the precise position of the Establishment as far as Courts of Discipline and Appeal are concerned. How extraordinary it is that good men should propose such a course, or think that a Christian Bishop or Church would be at liberty to pursue it!

"I hold that if a Church allows one proved to have taught and maintained fearful heresies to remain as a teacher of those heresies with her sanction, she sins against Christ—betrays Him and the truth which He has committed to her custody. Would St. Paul have allowed one teaching what Colenso teaches to remain a Bishop? Would Irenæus, or Cyprian, have done so? If not, how should it be lawful for us? The command of the Holy Ghost is to reject a heretic after the first and second admonition. What right have we to shrink from obeying this command till Parliament shall empower us? This is pure Erastianism. But next, Parliament cannot, nor can any other body, legislate in this matter. Colonies would not submit to English legislation in their internal affairs. And if an attempt were made in England to bring the Colonial Churches under

[1] The Bishop wrote from Kalk Bay.

the Privy Council, it would simply cause a disruption. We believe that Court to be not only full of danger to the Faith, but subversive in its constitution of the Church, and contrary to the Will of Christ and the Word of God. But how cruel the proposition to deliver over the Church of Natal to Colenso and his teaching for his life time! What a wrong to the souls of our people, what a wrong to the faithful Clergy! These are to be driven away,—(for they would leave),—our people are to be left without pastors, or with heretical ones: a Church in a rising Colony is to be destroyed, lest the Colonial Churches should run the risk of having gradually a different faith from the Church of England, or we should set up an orthodox Bishop against an heretical State one. Now if the Privy Council is to continue the Court of Appeal for the Church of England, a different faith will, I hope, be found by the Colonial Churches. We shall, I pray God, be saved from adopting the heresies allowed by law in the Church of England, and tolerated in that Church, but it will be not because we have changed the Faith once delivered, but because the Mother Church has insensibly changed hers. But we are not, in consecrating a Bishop of Maritzburg, setting up a Church Bishop against a State Bishop. The Crown has done all in its power to give legality to all our proceedings. I have acted throughout strictly in accordance with the provisions of the letters patent. But the Crown is now told by its Judges that it could not give a Metropolitan power to cancel letters patent given by it. The patent remains—it gives a title and a power to hold property as a corporation, nothing more. We do not interfere with these. The Crown did not give mission, or spiritual authority. That Christ gave through His Church—and this the Church takes away, and releases the faithful Clergy and Laity from all moral obligation. The Church also provides a faithful pastor for souls in the room of an unfaithful one.

"Of course there are dangers in this as in every course, and evils too. But the true and only safeguard is that prescribed by the Canons of the Church, and acted upon until the Civil power debarred the Church from the exercise of its rights. We

must restore our graduated system of Synods. Some years ago, Convocation, at my suggestion, pointed this out as the security for unity in faith and discipline, to all Colonial Churches. The Diocesan subject to Provincial; Provincial to National; National to Œcumenical. We are, I trust, on the high road to a National Synod, and before you die, you will, I hope, see the way paved for the Œcumenical."

The Priest here mentioned as recommended for the See of Natal by the Archbishop was the Rev. F. H. Cox, then at Hobart Town. He was suggested first by the Bishop of Oxford, who wrote to him on behalf of the Archbishop, and the Bishop of Cape Town likewise wrote expressing his belief that the Bishops of the Province would all concur in the Archbishop's appointment, as would probably the greater number of the Clergy and Laity of Natal. Mr. Cox received the announcement with great surprise, but after mature consideration, he declared himself prepared to leave Tasmania and accept the call, should it be confirmed by the Church in Natal.

Meanwhile, nothing could be more miserable than the state of things in Maritzburg. Dr. Colenso appealed to the Supreme Court (which, from all accounts, was not calculated to command respect from ordinarily good men any more than from Churchmen) to turn the Dean entirely out of the Cathedral, and give it up to himself. The Court refused to do this, saying that he had the same rights as from the first, until the question was tried. On Good Friday the intruder took possession of all the services, and shortly after cited the Dean, in order to obtain possession of the Registers, which of course were refused. Then followed another appeal to the Supreme Court, and a split among the Judges. But, in spite of all, Easter Day was full of blessings and consolations to the Church party, and at a gathering on Easter Monday at the Mayor's (to which Dr. Colenso was not asked) the Dean met a warm reception. On Easter Tuesday Dr. Colenso's friends tried to elect a churchwarden in his interest, but the endeavour failed, the person nominated not being a communicant, and consequently not qualified.

The Metropolitan strongly recommended the Natal Clergy to elect Mr. Cox at once. "Whether they will do so or not till Convocation speaks, I know not" (he writes, May 30th, 1866). "The Clergy of this Diocese and of Graham's Town are addressing the Dean of Maritzburg, who is a most Christian man. I think I had rather be in his spiritual state than in that of any other man in Africa. He is a confessor for Christ, if there be one on earth now. . . Colenso is bringing an action against me in the Natal Courts for the transfer to him of all property standing in my name."

It was during the Holy Week just alluded to that one at home passed away from among us, whose name will live in the affectionate veneration of English Churchmen as long as time endures. On Maundy Thursday, March 27th, Mr. Keble entered upon the rest of Paradise. His brother, Mr. Thomas Keble, wrote to tell the Bishop of this universally-felt loss, and he replied in a few lines fresh from his heart.

"Bishop's Court, Whitsun Monday, 1866.

My dear Sir—Many thanks for your kind note, announcing to me the loss which the Church has sustained through the death of your sainted brother. His memory will be cherished by generations yet to come, and his works serve to form the character of the Church's children from age to age. I have ever considered it one of my greatest privileges to have known him, and to receive his fatherly counsel. Amid the trials and anxieties of my present position, it has been a great comfort to know that he has approved of the course which I have felt it my duty to pursue. I had expected that dear Mrs. Keble would have been taken first. If still alive, will you give her my most respectful and tender sympathy? I look back with deep interest to the days I spent with them, and the beautiful simplicity, gentleness, and humility, of that loving, holy couple. —Believe me ever, my dear sir, yours faithfully,

"R. Capetown."

On the same day the Bishop wrote to his son:

"It comforts me greatly to find you heart and soul in the

work of your Lord. May He daily give you more grace, and make you an instrument of good to others. I never pray less than four times a day for you,—twice in chapel and twice in private, and at times oftener. This has been my practice ever since you left. God, my dearest child, has answered our many prayers. I do not wonder that you felt used up after Easter. It is the time when all who work need rest. I do not think you get away often enough. I am always anxious to get change for the Clergy here. It is good both for them and for the parish. . . . I want a man to send to the copper-mines in Namaqua Land. We went there by sea in H.M. ship 'Valorous,' had beautiful weather, rough journey over barren lands, sand, and mountains. I consecrated a nice little English church, and held many services. . . . I have written to-day by the Natal mail to urge the Clergy to elect Mr. Cox of Hobart Town, who is willing to come. The poor Dean is 'legally excommunicated!' 'outlawed'[1] by these people, who have openly sided with Colenso from the beginning. . . . Louisa is so unwell that Glover thinks he must take her to England in August for change of climate and advice. We shall probably be at home till September, when we propose to ride about 600 miles;—Ceres, Bokkeveld, Clanwilliam, Pikelberg, the Bays, Saldanha,

[1] "One of the Judges said that he was 'legally excommunicate,' and perhaps it would do him as much harm as the spiritual excommunication did Colenso! Their next step is to summon the Bishop of Cape Town to show cause why Colenso should not take possession of the Cathedral, as Trustee, instead of the Bishop of Cape Town. This is to be on July 2nd. I suppose this must lead to a regular trial and appeal, and expense again. The Archbishop, Bishops of Oxford and Graham's Town, have joined in recommending Mr. Cox of Hobart Town for election as Bishop. His letters are extremely nice. I believe he was suggested by Mr. Butler of Wantage."—*Letter from Mrs. Gray.*

As a specimen of the unfairness with which the Bishop of Cape Town and his proceedings were treated, it may be as well to mention that the *Times* of Whitsun Monday 1866 was made to announce that, "having deposed Dr. Colenso, he has, on his own authority, nominated a successor, to whom he will require the Clergy of the Diocese to pay canonical obedience;"—going on to give a sketch of Mr. Cox's past history! The Dean of Cape Town, who was in England, hastened to give an unqualified denial of this gratuitously false assumption; but, of course, for one person who reads and understands such rectifications, fifty are deceived by the falsehood.

and S. Helena. We shall have to go slower than I like, as I am going to ride Witte-bol, who is now full 17, and not so vigorous as he was, though still wonderfully full of life."

To Edward Gray, Esq.

"Bishop's Court, Whitsun Monday, 1866.

"We have just returned from Namaqua Land. Though nearly as large as Ireland, we have but one Clergyman in it. The copper-mines are prospering, and likely to be increased. I stood with the superintendent on one heap of black dust, intermingled with bright spots, which he told me was worth £40,000. We shall, I trust, be quietly at home for three months. . . . I am urging the Natal Clergy to elect Mr. Cox, recommended by the Primate. They wish to wait for the counsel of Convocation, and they may fairly do so, but S. Oxon counsels action. He quite and thoroughly approves of the excommunication. . . . God grant, my dear brother, that we may meet again in quiet times, when this terrible struggle shall be over. This has indeed been to me a 'Cabo Tormentoso.'[1] Thank God, my own Diocese is going on well, and work prospering, in spite of bad times; but I long for quiet, and to be able to give myself to my proper work. There is so much, so very much, to be done, if I could but be released from public affairs, which excite my mind and consume all my time."

Meanwhile, England and English people were scarcely, as a whole, standing up for their Faith and the Lord of that Faith as might have been expected. A large meeting of S. P. G., on April 27th, presided over by the Bishop of Oxford, did pass some strong resolutions, pledging themselves "by every means in their power to protect and defend the orthodox Church in Natal, and to hold communion with the Bishop to be appointed in Dr. Colenso's place, as well as to raise funds to be placed at the Bishop of Cape Town's disposal." Also, to send petitions to Convocation, "praying it to consider the best mode

[1] Alluding to the old name of the Cape of Good Hope.

by which to warn all Christian people against communicating with Dr. Colenso."

Miss Burdett Coutts (under the influence, doubtless, of others less believing and good than herself) took alarm at the idea of the See of Cape Town being pronounced independent of the English State, and developed some of the vague notions floating about the air concerning the supremacy, etc. Most certainly, neither she nor (one would fain hope) any professing Church people, would have endorsed Dr. Colenso's startling statement, that "in the system of the Church of England the Queen *does ordain* (!!!)—not directly, but virtually—the Clergy of all orders, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. What is done by ecclesiastics in this matter is done by them ministerially, by virtue of *power committed to them by the Queen*—I mean as representing the State—the *people*. This is not the Roman Catholic principle, according to which all power in the Church is derived from the Clergy; it is not the principle which many excellent persons suppose to be lying at the basis of the system of our National Church. But it is, I expect, *the fundamental principle of the Church of England!*" In spite of Dr. Colenso's "expectations," Church people will probably always believe that the power committed to the Clergy is so committed by Christ and his Church, and not by any one else. However widely differing from him, Miss Coutts had, however, presented a petition to the Queen, praying her Majesty to direct that "in any measure for amending the law with respect to the Bishops and Clergy in the said Colonies, care may be taken to preserve unimpaired to her Majesty and her successors the exercise of her regal supremacy in the appointment of Bishops,"—under the Bishop of London's patronage,—he explaining that she feared "events which have occurred and others announced as imminent threaten to divert those funds to independent Episcopal Churches not bound by or submitting to the laws of the Church at home, and openly repudiating that Royal Supremacy the exercise of which she conceives to be the one main safeguard whereby the various Provinces and Dioceses of the National Church are outwardly knit together in one law and discipline." It is marvellous

how some people seem resolved to deify State and Supremacy, and hardly less marvellous to see good people, counted as Christians, upholding directly or indirectly one seeking to be called a Bishop of Christ's Church, while distinctly disavowing the worship of Christ![1] Some such minds there were to be found, however, when two documents forced the Natal question upon Convocation—first in the shape of a petition presented on behalf of Dr. Colenso (which, by the way, accused the Archbishop of Canterbury of teaching perjury and schism) by the Dean of Westminster — the petitioners being all laymen and *not* all Church people — a petition which, for the credit of English Church dignitaries in general, one is thankful to be able to say was withdrawn by the Dean after some severe animadversions from his brethren. The other document was more important, and led to a prolonged discussion. A debate was held on the subject on May 2nd, 1866, at the close of which the President expressed his satisfaction at the very general and deep sympathy shown for the Church of South Africa; and on June 28th (after some conversation arising out of an Address from the American Bishops, which the President read to the House, congratulating the Church of England upon and thanking it for the resolution passed the previous summer concerning the African troubles, and in which the Bishops of London and S. David's took their usual line of opposition;)—the Bishop of Oxford opened a debate upon three questions addressed by the African Church to the

[1] See *Pall Mall Gazette* for April 3rd, 1866, containing a letter from Dr. Colenso, in which he states that he "objects to prayer to Christ on Scriptural and Apostolical grounds!" See also *Times* of September 6th, 1866, in which a letter from Dr. Colenso says: "I have drawn attention to the fact, that out of 180 Collects and prayers contained in the Prayer Book, only three or four at most are addressed to our Lord, the others being all addressed through Christ to Almighty God. I have said that there are also ejaculations in the Litany and elsewhere addressed to Christ. But I have shown that the *whole spirit* and the *general practice* of our Liturgy manifestly tend to discourage such worship and prayer, instead of making it the 'foundation stone' of common worship." "It appears" (Dr. Colenso goes on to say) "that the practice in question is not based on any Scriptural or Apostolical authority, but is the development of a later age, and has very greatly increased within the Church of England during the last century, beyond what (as the Prayer Book shows) was the rule at the time of the Reformation, chiefly, as I believe, through the use of unauthorised hymns."

Mother Church in England. The Archbishop had reduced them to writing, as follows:—

I. By the Bishop of Cape Town—"Whether the Church of England holds communion with Dr. Colenso and the heretical Church he is seeking to establish in Natal, or whether it is in communion with the orthodox Bishops who, in Synod, declared him to be *ipso facto* excommunicated?"

II. By the Dean of Maritzburg—"Whether the acceptance of a new Bishop on our part, whilst Dr. Colenso still retains the letters patent of the Crown, would in any way sever us from the Mother Church of England?"

III. "Supposing the reply to the last question to be that they would not be in any way severed, what are the proper steps for us to take to obtain a new Bishop?"

There was some petty skirmishing as to who was consulted —whether the "Convocation of the Province of Canterbury," or the Archbishop's suffragans, or the Upper House of Convocation. After this had been disposed of, the Bishop of Oxford went on to say that he could not but feel that that distant branch of our Church had, under present circumstances, a peculiar claim upon the English Church to consider and answer these questions. The State bonds, which bound us together, were manifestly crumbling in our hands, do what we would. The absolutely democratic character impressed, politically, on so many of our Colonial settlements, made it impossible for the Crown to give the *status* of Established Churches to these bodies, and with that *status*, intimate union with ourselves as of old. It was equally evident that it was most desirable for ourselves and for these communities that we should, in every lawful way, keep the bonds of intercourse firm between them and us. This great Church at home had, through her endowments, men of piety, great learning and study; and, through them, the means of answering such questions as may arise to shake the faith; and it was of the utmost consequence that the poorer Church should have the whole benefit of all that hoarded strength which the Providence of God has given to us in this country. It seemed to him on all grounds most desirable—by

every lawful means—to keep alive the connection between these our brother Churchmen and us, and to substitute the spiritual for the crumbling earthly relationship. Among those means, one of the very first was giving them advice under difficulty. In the common affairs of life, if we had one to whom we turned naturally for advice, and were lightly put aside by him, or his advice refused, we should not think we were kindly treated. The same rule applied here, and the Bishop thought these questions ought certainly to be answered. Dr. Colenso had been deprived of his spiritual office for expressing heretical opinions, and there was not one present who did not deeply regret that the errors of that unhappy man had rendered such proceedings necessary. Whatever difference of opinion might have existed at any former time, things had lately come before every one, which must have made it quite clear and past all doubt that his doctrine was not the doctrine of the Church. But this man held, by the Queen's patent, the titular rank of Bishop of Natal. The Sovereign never professed to give him spiritual authority—the Crown never professed to be the fountain of spiritual power. It professed to give him a title and ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and its highest court pronounced that it had failed to give this last. So now the people of Natal ask whether the Church of England holds communion with the titular Bishop of Natal, who, in spite of his deprivation and excommunication, is seeking to establish a heretical Church in Natal; or does it hold communion with the orthodox Bishops who have in Synod declared him, *ipso facto*, excommunicate? Bishop Wilberforce pointed to the fact that long before the full development of his evil doctrines, and before the public acts of the Church with regard to them all, the Bishops agreed privately not to allow this unhappy man to officiate in any of their dioceses, and urged him to resign his office. Therefore he proposed to answer the Bishop of Cape Town's question as follows:—"That it is the opinion of this House that the first portion of the question should be answered in the negative, and the second in the affirmative."

The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol seconded this motion.

The Bishop of S. David's then raised a variety of difficulties as to denying the communion of the Church of England with Dr. Colenso. The Bishop of Salisbury heartily concurred with the motion. After what had passed, and what had been made public very lately, which must have shocked everybody who still retained any hope as to Dr. Colenso's faith, he could have no hesitation as to whether the Church of England held communion with him. He thought it shirking their duty to do anything else but give a plain answer. He most entirely agreed with the Bishop of Oxford, and in the fullest confidence of doing right, voted that the Church of England did not hold communion with the heretical Church which Dr. Colenso sought to establish, but with the orthodox Bishops who excommunicated him for the course he had been and was now pursuing.

The Bishop of Lincoln (Jackson) did not know whether there was such an heretical Church. If he were asked whether he himself was in communion with Dr. Colenso, he should answer, without hesitation, "No;" and if Dr. Colenso were to present himself to be communicated in any church where he (the Bishop) was officiating, he should refuse him the communion. He believed the Bishops of South Africa to be in full communion with the Church of England, nevertheless he would not vote for the motion.

The Bishop of London thought none of his brethren, or himself, had the slightest doubt of the dangerous character of Bishop Colenso's books. He had done quite enough to convince them that he was quite unfit to exercise the office of a Bishop, and he—the Bishop of London—did not think Dr. Colenso could continue to perform its duties with any satisfaction to himself or to the Church. But he went on to speak in very harsh language of the Bishop of Cape Town, as arbitrary and seeking power, forcing his own opinions upon others, etc. etc. He (Dr. Tait) looked with suspicion on his questions and his deeds. It would seem that the Bishop of London was drawing back to his favourite doctrine of supremacy, for he ended by saying his brethren had no legal right to say the

Church of England was not in communion with the letter-patent-Church of Natal.

Speeches from the Bishops of Lichfield, Bangor, and Ely, followed, and the Bishop of Oxford in reply stated that he believed Dr. Colenso would be "no more able to get institution to a living in England than to be made Emperor of China." He also entered a solemn protest against all that Bishop Tait had said concerning the Bishop of Cape Town from beginning to end as most unjust.

"None of us" (he said) "doubt that if Bishop Colenso gives up prayer to Christ, and says it is not according to Scripture that prayer should be addressed to Him our Master, we should say we could not hold communion with him, or with those who followed him. There is not one of us who would not feel assured in his own mind as to the truth of the matter; but then the question is whether it is expedient for us to say what we believe to be the truth. Now, in my deliberate judgment, there is no doubt that we ought to say it. No sufficient ground has been alleged to make us incur the double peril, I may say the threefold peril—1st, of letting the poor ignorant flock there be led away from salvation; 2nd, of leaving our loyal-hearted and faithful brethren without the moral support we are bound to give them; 3rdly, the great danger of letting it go forth to God, to angels and men, that we value a sort of superhuman caution above risking something for maintaining the Truth of Christ; that we will not utter the word which would establish the truth, and put down the error." The Bishop urged his brethren to "incur the evanescent danger of speaking out for the greatest truths the Church of Christ ever held." He believed the whole history of Christ's Church showed that the Truth had only been maintained to this day by men venturing into danger to maintain it, by setting the maintenance of fundamental truth above every possible circumstance, by risking something for the Lord.

The President now mentioned an amendment proposed by the Bishop of Lincoln, which retained the affirmation of communion with the orthodox Bishops, but did not reply in the

negative to the first part of the question as to Dr. Colenso. The amendment was, after some discussion, put in this form:—"It is the opinion of this House that the Church of England holds communion with the Bishop of Cape Town, and with those Bishops who lately with him in Synod declared Bishop Colenso to be *ipso facto* excommunicated."

This was carried, and the Bishop of Oxford proceeded to propose to answer the second question (as to the acceptance of a new Bishop) in these words: "It has been decided on appeal to the highest judicial Court in this kingdom, on the one hand, that the Church in the Province of Natal in communion with the United Church of England and Ireland, is, in the eye of the law, merely a voluntary association; and, on the other hand, as the letters patent do not profess to confer spiritual powers, and have been declared by the Court to convey no Episcopal jurisdiction, it is the judgment of this House that the acceptance of a new Bishop does not impair the connection or alter the relations existing between the Mother Church and the members of the Church in the Province of Natal;—provided, first, that the Bishop be canonically consecrated according to the use of the Church of England; and, secondly, that there be no invasion of the title of the Bishop of Natal conveyed by her Majesty's letters patent."

The Bishop of Oxford thought it very important that this question should be answered, and spoke at some length in support of his opinion, as did the Bishop of Gloucester. The Bishop of S. David's then made a paradoxical speech, the purport of which was, that though really the Bishop of Natal was convicted of heresy, and that he himself thought so, it would not do to "yield to first impressions;"—and with a sneer at "one eminent person revered" by the Church, he said it was possible by a skilful use of language to establish paradoxical opinions. Nor did he see how a new Bishop could be accepted till he was made and offered, etc. etc.

The debate was resumed the next day (June 29th), when the Bishop of Oxford proposed as answer to the third question (it being agreed that the second and third must be taken

together): "If it should be decided that a new Bishop be consecrated, as to the proper steps to be taken; it is the opinion of this House, first, that a formal instrument declaratory of the doctrine and discipline of the Church of South Africa should be prepared, which every Bishop, Priest, and Deacon appointed to office should be required to subscribe; secondly, that a godly and well-learned man should be chosen by the Clergy, with the assent of the lay communicants of the Church; and thirdly, that he should be presented for consecration, either to the Archbishop of Canterbury (if the aforesaid instrument should declare the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England), or to the Bishops of South Africa, according as hereafter may be judged most advisable and convenient."

The Bishop of London did not know what this resolution meant; whether it was to say "Go on," or "Do not go on." His opinion was that the House had better not say "Go on." He did not quite collect the meaning of the resolution, but he inferred that it meant "Go on."

The Bishop of Gloucester. "Not necessarily."

Bishop of London. "Then does it mean 'Do not go on'?"

Bishop of Gloucester. "Not necessarily."

Bishop of London. "Then it means nothing at all."

Bishop of Oxford. "It does not mean to answer the question which *you* have put to us, but the question which *they* have put to us."

Various opinions were then expressed. The Bishop of Lincoln deprecated the appointment of a new Bishop, because, though as he said, Natal was far worse off than if it had no Bishop at all, he was convinced the only way of maintaining Dr. Colenso in his present position and struggle was the opposition of another Bishop. If you let him alone, a man placed in such an atmosphere of unbelief as he had placed himself in, must soon collapse, he thought. The Bishop of Salisbury in speaking to the point, took occasion to rebuke the Bishop of London for the manner in which he had spoken of the Bishop of Cape Town, and of testifying that he did not believe there existed a more single-minded, simple-hearted, earnest,

devoted man, or a man less deserving the charge of being ready to dictate to his brethren. He also defended Dr. Pusey, whom he supposed the Bishop of S. David's to have indicated the day before as like to the Bishop of Natal in "explaining away" truths. The two men stood as the antipodes to each other; the one "to whom so many of us owe our very souls, is the earnest, uncompromising, and yet tender affectionate maintainer and builder-up of the Faith of Christ, while the other would pull it down." The Bishop of S. David's said he was alluding not to the Eirenicon but to Tract XC., whereupon the Bishop of Salisbury reaffirmed all he had said, for Dr. Pusey had republished Tract XC.

The argument between the four Bishops of London, S. David's, Oxford, and Salisbury grew warm, and the President tried to stop it. After several speakers had expressed their opinions at some length, the Bishop of S. David's declared that he thought it from every point of view unlawful to create a Bishop with a new title for Natal, and if it were not unlawful, in the highest degree inexpedient and mischievous. He maintained that Dr. Colenso was the lawful Bishop in every respect, though he did not mean in the slightest degree to say that he was fit for the office; on the contrary, he was strongly inclined to say he was not. But he believed the trial to be no trial, to be null and void, and he did not think Dr. Colenso had ever been rightly deposed.

It would almost have seemed that to "mean nothing" was the highest object of language and of the opposing Bishops,—an opinion clenched by the Bishop of Ely when he proposed to vote, without any preamble, "that it appears to this House that the deprivation of a Bishop by the ecclesiastical authorities of South Africa, if legally conducted, and the election and consecration of another Bishop in his room, would not sever the union between that Church and the Church of England," because such a resolution "would commit them to nothing." How pitiful the whole scene would have been in the eyes of a company of primitive Bishops one hardly dares venture to allow oneself to think! Even the Bishop of S. David's remarked that they "appeared all to be at sixes

and sevens"! The next several speakers hardly diminished this undignified aspect of matters. The Bishop of Peterborough did not think they need take on themselves the responsibility of saying to the Colonial Church, "Consecrate a Bishop for Natal," though he was by no means prepared to say it might not be their duty to do so. The Bishop of Oxford strove to make his brethren more definite. What, he asked, if when a judge sends an issue to a jury, instead of giving a simple verdict thereupon, the jury were to say, "This is a most important point, property of hundreds of thousands of pounds hangs upon it, we really cannot find or give an answer"? The true question, he argued, was whether Dr. Colenso was the real Bishop of Natal. "If he be, I will acknowledge him in no half way, by merely refusing to give advice on this or that point, but in the bravest and boldest way. I will support him in his claim to the spiritual charge of the Diocese, and, come what may, I will stand by him in it." . . . The Bishop proceeded to justify the proceedings of Dr. Colenso's trial, going on to say, "That is the case of this man: he is tried before a spiritual authority, who, I maintain, had the true right to try him; his defence was heard, he was condemned, and by that sentence I for one am content to abide. I therefore answer my right reverend brother of S. David's that his case has broken down, and that the trial was *not* imperfect in the sense which he alleges. If then any of us reject the proposal to give the counsel asked on this ground, I declare in the face of the Church that such persons hold Dr. Colenso to be Bishop of Natal spiritually as well as in title. But I hope there are none here who will be ready to take this responsibility on themselves. Every now and then God's Providence throws on men responsibility which they would most thankfully avoid, but if they are His faithful servants, avoid it they cannot. By seeking to escape the difficulty you feel in giving this answer, I verily believe you are in danger of incurring this guilt. This, then, as to the main point of acknowledging Bishop Colenso as spiritual head of the Diocese of Natal. But a second point was alleged, the *inexpediency* of giving the answer for which we are asked. I bar this whole argument

by saying that if it is right it is also expedient." After exhausting this and one or two minor points, the Bishop of Oxford went on to say:

"I think there is no other argument left to answer. . . . We have been reminded of the danger of setting up throne against throne. I will ask how it would have been in any age of the Church when heretical Bishops arose, if the Church had yielded to such an argument as that; if, when a Bishop had been deposed by a council, or by trial in his Province, and had refused to yield, and persisted in his evil teaching, the Church Catholic had said, 'We dare not set up throne against throne; because no evil is so great as that of schism.' Would she have retained the truth of God to the present day? Was it thus she dealt with Arius? Was it thus that Athanasius acted when he made his glorious stand against that pernicious heresy? Who can say that God's promise that the Church should maintain the faith to the end, did not then hang on the fidelity of the body to which he had committed the custody of doctrine? It is on the same great principles I now ask you to act. I maintain that I have shown that by the law spiritual, this man is deprived of the functions spiritual of Bishop of his Diocese. I maintain that the law of the land left those who deprived him free to take that action in the case which seemed to them desirable, expedient, and necessary for the enforcement of their own rules of discipline. I beg you to consider how bravely, how nobly, how carefully they acted for the truth of God, under circumstances of almost unparalleled difficulty: these men, your brethren, in the great trust of the faith, come now and ask your counsel; and I only ask you not to turn away in coldness, or timidity, or scorn, when such counsel is asked of you, or by an evasive answer to disappoint those who have consulted you."

The President then put the amendment, for which only the Bishops of London, Lincoln, and Ely voted. It was therefore negatived. The original motion having been amended by the substitution of the words "that the existence of the letters patent would not cause the acceptance of a new Bishop to in-

volve any loss of communion," for the words, "that the acceptance of a new Bishop does not impair the connection, or alter the relations existing" between the members of the Church in Natal and the Church of England.

The venerable President, in recording his vote, expressed his deep sympathy for the South African Church, affirming that he held the Bishop of Natal to be legally and canonically deposed.

To the third question the Bishop of Oxford now again proposed the answer already mentioned. He said that he agreed with the Archbishop in not wishing to give direct counsel to the Church of Natal to elect a Bishop;[1] he thought the responsibility of the decision rested with them, and on the same ground that he could not throw up a responsibility belonging to England, he would not encourage them to throw up one belonging to themselves.

The Bishop of Gloucester seconded the resolution, pressing the value of the declaration of faith alluded to in it, which the Bishop of S. David's observed had been practically instituted already. The motion was then put and agreed to, and sent down to the Lower House, where, on the first resolution being read, Archdeacon Denison moved that the House should agree to it, seconded by the Rev. T. W. Joyce; Canon Seymour moving a rider, "And they are farther of opinion that, Dr. Colenso having been not only excommunicated by the aforesaid Synod but also deposed from his office of Bishop, if a Bishop shall be duly elected and consecrated for the See of Natal in the place of Bishop Colenso, the Church of England would of necessity hold communion with that Bishop." Archdeacon Denison seconded this motion, which brought the Dean of Westminster to the front, going into the whole story from the beginning, and endeavouring to deal with it from an absurd point of view, *e.g.* asserting that this rider committed the House to affirming that if the Bishop of Cape Town (whom he kindly asserted to be "a highly respectable clergyman") deprived a Bishop for the

[1] Of course this only meant *as Convocation*, inasmuch as both Archbishop and Bishop of Oxford had, in their individual capacity, not only counselled the act, but recommended the man.

colour of his hair, he had full right to do so. A highly declamatory speech followed, of which, as the Dean afterwards candidly acknowledged some of its inaccuracies,[1] it is perhaps charitable to say but little, beyond that it was very much applied to work up public feeling against the Bishop of Cape Town, as what would now be called an "advanced ritualist," likely to deprive his Comprovincials for not using incense, or wafer bread, or the like, and accompanied with sensational outbursts denouncing woe to the Colonial Church! woe to its freedom, to its independence, its influence, if it is thus to be deprived of every privilege that makes the freedom of the British citizen dear to us! etc. etc. The argument of the speech is hardly worth going into, the personal criticisms of the Bishop of Cape Town still less so, though it is satisfactory to learn that, although the Dean had "a very slight acquaintance with him, he had no reason to doubt that he was a highly respectable person!" The rest of the speech was intended (apparently) as an elaborate defence of Dr. Colenso, whose only offence, the Dean seems to imply, was his "narrow-minded attack on *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, which was a transgression of courtesy and moderation. Later on the Dean did admit that Dr. Colenso had spoken "indecorously" of the Prayer Book. The Dean followed Bishop Thirlwall's line as to Tract XC. being on the same level with Dr. Colenso's books, and in so many words took his own stand on Dr. Colenso's ground, claiming for their alliance certain Fathers of the Church, who, we are disposed to believe, would have disposed of such would-be adherents without much "courtesy or moderation."

The Archdeacon of Westminster (Wordsworth) gave an emphatic answer to this speech, and Canon Seymour probably expressed the general feeling of Christians in saying that it gave him great pain to see such abilities as those of the Dean devoted to the justification of an unhappy man whom he believed the majority of that House, as well as the great majority of the whole Church of Christ, looked upon as an apostate from the Faith. He was thankful for Archdeacon Wordsworth's

[1] "Statement."

speech, "showing that there is a very opposite statement respecting Dr. Colenso's writings to that put before the House by the Dean of Westminster, and also showing that, according to the ancient laws of the Church of Christ, the condemnation was sufficient to justify Convocation in what it was doing."

After some more discussion, in which the most notable remarks fell from Chancellor Massingberd and Archdeacon Randall; who thought no technical difficulties ought to be allowed to hinder the Mother Church from heartily upholding and helping the sorely troubled African Church, and who also, referring to Miss Burdett Coutts and her generosity to the See of Cape Town, sympathised with her disappointment at not carrying out her intentions just as she had expected, but could not suppose that she would retract her generous purposes because the scheme was not carried out exactly as she had desired, concluding with a strong expression of his own belief that every new See constituted, and every new church erected, would draw the Churches of England and Africa more and more closely together, cementing the bond of union throughout the world, and making greater the prospect of bringing in the heathen, and restoring the Kingdom of God. The resolutions of the Upper House were then carried, and the debate closed.

On receiving the report of this debate, the Bishop wrote to Bishop Wilberforce:—

"August 9th, 1866.

"My dear Bishop—A stray ship has brought the Resolutions of the Upper House of Convocation *in re* Colenso, and the election of a Bishop. I bless God for what He has enabled you to accomplish. These decisions will have a very important bearing on this case, and, as I venture to think, upon the Church herself. . . . The first Resolution reached me two days before the later ones, and gave me two bad nights. It is greatly neutralised by the subsequent proceedings. But it has given me great pain, chiefly on account of the Mother Church herself, whose nakedness I felt that I had been uncovering. I confess that I cannot understand how the cobwebs of State law should have influenced good men like —— and —— to

act as they did. Here is a Church brought face to face in her highest Synod with the greatest heresies of modern times. She is asked whether she holds communion with the propounder of them. Her answer is, I do not know. We have not heard the last of this. I doubt not that the Conventicle has rung with coarse accusations of complicity with heresy, and I am prepared for the taunts and sarcasms of the Romanists. I confess, but for the later Resolutions, I should have trembled for the Church of England.

"August 14th.

"Since writing the above, I have seen the full report of the speeches in Convocation. I have read it with exquisite pain and humiliation. The sympathy with Colenso on the part of ——, their hatred to me for the course I have felt constrained to take, the indifference to truth on the part of such men as —— the feebleness of others, the willingness to be in communion with a great heretic, the ignorance that communion with him committed those who did communicate to heresy—the want of pity for our poor brethren . . . all, all is very sad. I do not see how matters can remain where they are upon this point. . . . Would to God these men would study the Epistles to the Seven Churches of Asia on their knees."

To the Dean of Cape Town, then in England, Bishop Gray wrote:

"August 16th, 1866.

. . . "We have received the debate. . . The resolutions would be all good enough in themselves, if it were not for the terms of the question as to communion. I confess that the course pursued has filled me with very great anxiety. It has given me four wretched nights. Here is a Church brought face to face in her highest Synod with the greatest heresies of modern times. The teacher of those heresies has been cut off from the communion of the Church. He boasts publicly that his judges have thereby cut themselves off; that he is the true representative Bishop of the Church of England in Africa; that he has taught nothing contrary to what she teaches.

Many poor souls believe him, and gather round him as their great teacher. For their sakes, for ours, for the sake of the Church of England herself, we ask the Synod of the Church to say whether it is in communion with him or not. It expressly and deliberately, after long time for consideration, refuses to say that the Church of England is not in communion with the heresiarch, who teaches openly that it is unscriptural and wrong to pray to our Lord! He is thus entitled to affirm that by the admission of the Church itself he is not out of its communion. But what a position does this place the Church of England in! If she refuses to cast him off, is she not implicated in his heresy? If the Lord is walking up and down amidst the Church, if the Epistles to the Seven Churches have any bearing upon ourselves, what is the present condition of our Mother Church? I confess that her act fills me with the deepest alarm, lest her candlestick should be removed. No Church that I know of has ever before now synodically and expressly repudiated a resolution declaring that it held no communion with a teacher who affirmed that our Lord is not a proper object of worship. She must, I believe, repent of that, her act, or perish. Nothing can be more feeble than to say he might be presented to a living, and the Church forced to hold communion with him. For, first, the law could not do this; and next, is it meant by this that if the law forced a Deist or Mahometan upon the Church, the act would be acquiesced in? If not, does not the acquiescence in the case of one who declares Christ ought not to be adored, show that the heresy itself does not appear so awful in the eye of the Church? And this, surely, is the secret cause of this sad act of the Bishops of the Church. They are not prepared to witness for Christ, or to reject this new manifestation of Antichrist. The acquiescence in the judgment respecting Wilson and Williams, the allowing them to have cure of souls in her name and with her authority, followed by her tacit permission to men whose writings she has declared heretical to preach in her great Church at Westminster, has prepared her for this avowed toleration of Colenso; and I verily believe will lead to

a further loss of grace, and the forfeiture of her standing as a living branch of Christ's Church if she does not retrace her steps. '*Mene, mene.*' I think the faithful in England should not let the matter rest where it is, but that they should represent to the Fathers of the Church the distress and alarm with which their proceedings have filled them, and call upon them to renounce communion with the heresiarch. If this is not done, I, for one, believe that the Church of England has forfeited her right to become what I have loved to think God was calling her to be—the salt of the whole earth—the centre round which all other Churches might draw in one communion and one faith."

To the BISHOP of OXFORD.

"Bishop's Court, July 12th, 1866.

"My dear Bishop—I must write you a line to thank you for the part taken by you in Convocation, and at the S. P. G. meeting. I feel very grateful. I have written to the timid Bishops pointing out that

"I. I referred questions to Canterbury, because of our special relations by the letters patent to that See.

"II. That, regarding Convocation as the Church of England by representation, we wished to know with whom that body holds communion—Colenso or us?

"III. Whether that body thought that the election of a Bishop would be undutiful to the Church of England?

"We asked no legal question, and did not want to involve the Mother Church in legal difficulties. We should be quite satisfied if the Bishops in Synod replied, We do not hold, and dare not hold, communion with Dr. Colenso; and if he were to come to England, we would warn our flocks not to hold communion with him. If they are not prepared to say thus much, I grieve for them and for the Church of England. It will be infinitely worse for them than for us. . . May God overrule all to His Glory and the advancement of our Lord's Kingdom here and everywhere."

It should also be said that on June 18th, in the House of Lords, the Bishop of London (Tait) had presented a petition

from Miss Burdett Coutts concerning, not Cape Town only, but also the Sees of Adelaide and British Columbia, towards which she had acted so liberally, and the Archbishop of York, a few days later, moved for a Committee to inquire into the relation between the Church in the Colonies and the Church by law established in England. The Bishop of London declared that it would be time for the Colonies to be independent in ecclesiastical things when they were so in civil matters. But, as it was remarked at the time, this was mere phraseology. There actually existed an appeal from the civil courts of every Colony to a civil tribunal at home, called the Queen in Council, but there could be no appeal to any ecclesiastical tribunal at home, from any Colony where no ecclesiastical Court existed. There cannot be an appeal from that which is not a Court to that which is!

The various hard things said by those who should have known better, led to the publication of a letter from one well qualified to give an opinion, the Rev. and Hon. Henry Douglas, which should find its place here. He writes, July 10th, 1866, to the Editor of the *Guardian*:

"Sir—The Bishop of London has recently referred to the conduct of the Bishop of Cape Town on three different occasions, and on each occasion in severe terms. In his letter to Sir George Grey he used the word 'rash.' In his speech in the House of Lords he depreciated the Bishop of Cape Town's zeal as wanting in discretion. In Convocation he implied that the Bishop of Cape Town, if his power was equal to his will, would drive from his Province all whose views are 'Evangelical.' All this within the last few weeks.

"Now, I shall not stop to show that such language as this, coming from the Bishop of London, will add greatly to the cares of one whose burden is already heavy, and will help that erring man who is endeavouring to force himself upon a Diocese which is unwilling to receive him again; but I must say, with all respect, that it is neither fair nor just. The Bishop of Cape Town, at the request of the whole Bench of English Bishops (the Bishop of London, I believe, included), and with the advice and guidance of the best ecclesiastical lawyers, under-

took to try the then Bishop of Natal." (Here follow the details of Synod, the unanimous voice of the Clergy, etc.) "And the steps which have followed have received a very general support. Indeed, the Bishop of London must himself concur in the substance of the sentence, for he has spoken of Dr. Colenso as unfitted for the office of a Bishop in the Church. Now, surely, if the Church is the body of Christ, and the temple of the Holy Ghost, unanimity like this in the Bishops and Clergy of a Province is a fact of remarkable importance; at any rate it might show that the policy of the Bishop of Cape Town commends itself to those who are most deeply concerned in the issue, and might shield him from personal assaults. But I deny these charges of rashness and indiscretion, whether as applied to the Bishop or to the Church. When we speak of rashness, we intend, I suppose, to designate conduct the very opposite to that of one who, when about to build, should count the cost of his undertaking. When we speak of indiscretion, we imply the presence of that heat and impetuosity of temper which hurries away the judgment, and aims at ends without a wise selection of means. I must deny, then, that the Bishop of Cape Town has been either rash or indiscreet. The position which he has taken up is the result of calm deliberation, and his resolutions have been adopted upon principle, and with a full and clear perception of the worst consequences which might ensue. There are times and occasions when it is right to dare and suffer everything for the sake of that which must be kept at all cost; and, from the moment that he passed the sentence of deposition, the Bishop of Cape Town felt that such a time had come to him. He knew that the law would be invoked, although the Church in which he ruled had been declared by law to be beyond its jurisdiction. He feared that those from whom he looked for aid in England would, some of them, be lukewarm in their zeal for truth. But he resolved to build his tower;—resolved on it as a matter of duty, of faith, of obedience to Christ;—and, with God's Help, he will finish it. He will give to Cæsar the obedience to which Cæsar has a claim; but he will not give to Cæsar things which belong to God.

"You may call this resolution rashness. I take leave to think that history will call it courage,—wise, faithful, holy courage. Already, indeed, the Church in Scotland and the Colonies have recorded their thankfulness and admiration, and the Church in the United States—Bishops, Priests, and people, with perfect unanimity—has voted its unqualified applause. Such, too, is even now the verdict of those in England who can look upon the Church of Christ as something more than an Establishment, and who can see that the salt has already begun to lose its value when its savour is too weak to maintain and preserve the truth. The last of the three charges could not possibly be made by one who personally knew the circumstances of the Church in Southern Africa. The Bishop of Cape Town, though definite in his own opinions as to doctrine, has long worked heartily with many earnest men, Clergy and Catechists, whose views would best be described as 'evangelical.' Some such men have been appointed by himself; others are to be found among his warmest supporters. But the fact is, party spirit, as known in England, scarce exists out of England,—certainly does not run high. When earnest men find themselves upon the shores of a Colony, they soon discover that there is no ground on which a Bishop or a Priest can stand, except the commission of Christ and the authority of the Church. Once on that Rock differences soon vanish. Listening for some guiding voice amid the strife of opinions and the confusion of tongues which babble round them, men catch from their Prayer-books the sound of that voice which has spoken through the long ages of the past, and become one in mind while listening to it. Men account for the unanimity of the Colonial Church by the secret power of some mysterious autocracy, which is supposed to have gagged society. The real source of unanimity is the welcome of legitimate authority by a free and unfettered Church. H. Douglas."

Storms might bluster, and men in high position might say hard and false things, but Bishop Gray knew his standing ground, and nothing could turn him from his duty to his Lord.

The day on which he heard of the first debate in Convocation, he wrote a hasty line to his brother as follows:—

"June 11th, 1866.

"Mail only in to-day, leaves again to-morrow. . . . Debate of Bishops in Convocation disappointing; the Clergy of Natal now cannot elect till they speak out. I believe men would find no great difficulty in speaking boldly, if they realised the Atonement, and felt that the maintenance of the Faith within the Church was the *first* concern of all her members; that, whatever were the consequences, this was to be affirmed. . . . Poor Dean Green came down here to consult the Bishop of Graham's Town and me about the election of a Bishop. He is full of hope, patience, and trust, and as cheerful as ever—a man of faith and love if there be one. I believe all the Clergy of our several Dioceses, or nearly all, are addressing him—400 of his laity have just done so. Dean Douglas[1] does not give a hopeful account of the state of the intellectual condition of England and Scotland,—doubt, unsettledness, scepticism."

Again he writes to the same:

"July 12th, 1866.

. . . "We are all much *in statu quo*. You will hear how poor Colenso is sinking deeper and deeper. . . . I have been writing to the Bishops about their Convocation speeches. . . . The Church will work its way, under Divine guidance, through its difficulties, let the opposition be what it will. It is a great comfort to me to think that my own Clergy are so true and sound. . . . I am at this moment almost blind with writing all day. Poor —— is evidently set up by the praise received; and expects to rule the Church. Such a course will, I fear, lead to a loss of grace. . . . We propose to ride 600 miles in September. So you see that we are yet in some vigour. The Glovers go home next month. Louisa is not ill, but needs care and advice. It leaves me very shorthanded. We shall, I trust, my dear brother, meet again here below; if

[1] Now Bishop of Bombay.

not, then above, when the warfare shall be over, and the victory won. I do not look myself for a long life, and you will probably last us all out, though you say you are getting old. My life has been that of an old post-horse; a good deal of drudgery, and wear and tear; and at times a good deal of overwork."

To the Rev. CHARLES NORRIS GRAY, Kidderminster.

"Bishop's Court, July 12th, 1866.

"My dearest boy—Thanks for your long letter. I think it would be very desirable for you to go to Cuddesden for a month previous to your Priest's ordination, for study, meditation, quiet, and prayer, and I hope that the plan will be carried out. . . . I hope that you take proper care of your health—having regular meals, etc. I think also that change and relaxation are very desirable. I always used to get regular holidays when I had a parish. I do not attach much importance to ——'s opinions on religious questions. He is a sensible man, but not a really zealous and devoted one. I do not believe that the Church of England will ever admit the Pope's Infallibility, or *worship* the Blessed Virgin. We have our faults, God knows, and we may perish, but I rather trust that God is raising up our Church to be His chief witness upon the earth—to be the centre round which others may gather; the instrument to be used for the restoration of unity. This is no new view. I preached it all over England twenty years ago before I came out, and the Church has taken great strides in this direction since. We have nothing very new here. A Wesleyan coloured congregation, with its pastor, has just come over to us. I shall have to buy their premises, and build a new chapel. We opened on Monday a new school, which Foster (a layman) has built, and which will probably hereafter form part of a Church Institution. . . . I do not give up the Irish Church. I never give up anything that ought not to be abandoned, but hope and fight, however poor the prospect of success. 'Without were fightings, within were fears,' St. Paul says; but for all that he struggled on, and yielded nothing that ought to be maintained. The Irish Church

is, I believe, the same Church as St. Patrick's. The succession is certainly with it, not with Rome. Its ecclesiastical position is a better one than ours. It needs only to be lifted up within, to be less controversial, more earnest in work, *more like a Church*, to recover lost ground.—Ever your affectionate father,

"R. CAPETOWN."

Mrs. Gray writes by the same mail to her son:—"The Archbishop says the Bishops will do better next time! 'Next time,' I suppose, is past now, and I have good hope that they will speak out enough at least to strengthen our hands in Natal. . . . I am glad you are able, in the midst of England, to take the Colonial view of separation of Church and State. The Dean is quite astonished at the Erastianism of even good Churchmen in England."

To Mrs. WILLIAMSON.

"Bishop's Court, July 17th, 1866.

"My dearest Annie . . . We will never submit to the Privy Council, and would break with the Church of England sooner than do so, because we believe that Court will, sooner or later, unless itself destroyed, destroy the Church. I do not think that Erastians know a hundreth part of the strength of our convictions and determination upon this point. All who endeavour to bring us under subjection to the State are doing all in their power to break up our Communion. We shall rejoice to be governed by a National Synod. We never will submit to State-made laws as to what our faith shall be. The judgments of the Privy Council have sunk too deep into our souls and consciences for that. These, however, are hardly topics for you. I am glad, dearest, to hear such good accounts of you. Depressed at times you cannot fail to be; but you have the great comfort of feeling as sure as one can be of what is not actually known, that your dear one is with Christ, his Lord and Master, and that before very long you will be there too. I am sure that this hope is yours, and that you can live upon it now;—that your heart is there where he is—not on

his account only or chiefly, but because of your love to your Lord. May this love grow deeper and brighter in each of us, my dear sister, daily."

To Edward Gray, Esq.

"Bishop's Court, August 11th, 1866.

"My dear Edward—I trust that you are quite right again. As you say, we are all getting old, and drawing near the end, William, you, and Annie (I have you all booked) and I, the only ones left of that large family! I have tender recollections of all that are gone before. Thank God we both continue quite well, and had the Bishop of Graham's Town arrived, should have started to-morrow week on a 600 miles' ride. He does quite right to stay, but it throws me out, as I must see him and decide as to our future course. You think me, I plainly see, more than half a rebel! But I have violated no human law yet, and, as far as I can see, shall have no call to do so. But 'we ought to obey God rather than man;' and if human law conflict with the Divine law, I hope I should not waver as to my course. I have not yet heard from any one as to the proceedings in Convocation, but our course seems pretty clear. I suppose the Natal Clergy will elect. Sir W. Palmer (a great authority) writes me a vehement letter, earnestly entreating that, notwithstanding Convocation, we will assume the title of Bishop of Natal. I hear Stanley has made a fierce speech of four hours long. I trust that I may be spared the necessity of answering it. The Bishop of Graham's Town says that the Dean of Cape Town ought to reply. Archdeacon Jacob of Winchester writes to me about it. Lord Carnarvon will be all right on Church questions. I had a good deal to do with him when Under Secretary, and he was not staggered, though he wrote me word that one of my letters, claiming the right to consecrate a Bishop independently of the Crown, fell like a bombshell upon the Office! . . . I am alarmed at seeing by the Bank returns just come in, that had it not been for the payment of £1000 by Douglas, I should have nothing in either my public or private account. . . . I wish that I could now and

then pop in upon you, but my work seems to be here just now."

To the Right Hon. JOHN MOWBRAY, M.P.

"Bishop's Court, August 11th, 1866.

. . . "I am very glad to see you in your old office again. I wish I could think you would hold it long, but unless Dizzy can come near Gladstone as a financier, which I fear is hopeless, you must give place. I am very glad to see Lord Carnarvon at the Colonial Office. He is a man whom I have often wished to see more prominent. Lord Cranborne, too, I am thankful to see in so important a post—one perhaps of the most delicate and difficult. I trust that he will prove equal to it. Lord Carnarvon, I hear, wishes to bring in Cardwell's bill. You will, I trust, support it. There are only two courses—Establishment, or Free Churches. The *tertium quid* of non-established Churches under the Privy Council we are not prepared to accept. If this is forced upon us, you will drive us into open disruption. . . The only clause in the Colonial bill that I object to is that quasi-connection with the State, derived from the English Bishops consecrating Colonial Bishops under the license of the Crown. I suppose such judges as have hitherto sat on appeals would decide that this brought us under the Crown as represented by the Privy Council. I do not envy the Government the task before it."

To the BISHOP of OXFORD.

"Bishop's Court, August 31st, 1866.

. . . "The debate in Convocation has created very painful impressions here. . . . I picture you just reaching Lavington, and enjoying your rest, and think over the happy days spent there with you. I would give something for another gallop along your downs, but I am going another way, a ride of 600 miles over a wretched country with my wife!"

Early in this year the Metropolitan had appointed the Rev. and Hon. H. Douglas of Hanbury his Commissary, writing to him as follows:—

"My dear Douglas—You probably heard of the meeting of Colonial Bishops and Clergy in London last year, and the results. . . . Among other conclusions to which they came, was one inviting the several Colonial Bishops to appoint Commissaries, or Chancellors resident in England, whose duty it would be 'to consult together on matters relating to the Colonial Church, and to correspond promptly with the several Bishops, so as to elicit their opinions, and obtain their united action on the occurrence of questions affecting the status and welfare of the Church in the Colonies.' I have given my adhesion to the formation of such a body. Will you consent to act as my Commissary? . . . I apprehend that the duties will not be heavy. Probably there will be an annual meeting during the London season. The Commission would only be for a temporary purpose. My view would be to cut away every remaining chain which binds the Colonial Churches to the Establishment; to strengthen every bond which unites them to the Church. Two things should, I think, be kept in view:—The calling upon the Government to cease to issue in the 'Royal Instructions' to Governors, any directions respecting the appointment of Clergy paid by Legislatures of the several Colonies, and to leave the Church to manage all these questions of patronage as unfettered as the other voluntary associations, *e.g.* Romanists and Wesleyans. And far before this—to press the calling together of a National Synod by the Archbishop. . . Probably our Commissaries would watch such legislation as men like —— might seek to introduce. I protest against *any* legislation for us. We don't want it. All we ask is to be let alone, and to be declared free from any pretensions of the Privy Council in consequence of our letters patent or our being consecrated by Mandate from the Queen. We will not work in chains, as the Mother Church does."

In the following letter to his son, the Bishop alludes to his "Statement" just then written, and an important document in the history of this anxious period of Church history.

"Bishop's Court, September 10th, 1866.

"The Bishop of Graham's Town keeps us in a state of great uncertainty. We ought to start this day week, we must to-morrow week, and then ride 50 miles to our and the horses' dissatisfaction the first day. I have a new horse to ride, and not altogether a pleasant one. . . . We do not like the journey: the roads are very sandy, accommodation very bad, chiefly Dutch farmers—scenery tame—places at a great distance from each other—mixed services of Dutch and English. Our Parliament has just begun its sitting with a revenue of £600,000, expenditure more than £700,000. A large debt, general poverty. A move is again to be made to carry the voluntary principle, which, if successful, would take away about £2400 per annum from this Diocese, and place us in a difficult position. I have written a pamphlet containing a statement as to facts which have been misunderstood or misrepresented *in re* Colenso, with remarks upon the important questions which have been raised in connection with this case. I am afraid I cannot get it ready for this mail, and I shall be in the saddle up to the departure of the next mail. I cannot finish it till I have the full debates in both Houses of Convocation, and these have not yet reached us. It will be at least a record for future use, for this matter cannot rest where the Upper House of Convocation has left it, with safety to the Church of England. I have had no mail from Natal since I sent up the replies of Convocation. We are looking hourly for the Bishop of Graham's Town. Sept. 18th, Just received your letter of August 7th. I am very glad that you have been to a Retreat and received good. If it forces you to look into yourself, and show you up to yourself, it *must* do good. Let the fruit be lasting. I shall think of you much on Sunday. I have no Ordination on that day. May you receive fresh grace and power from on high, for the work of the ministry." . .

To Mrs. WILLIAMSON.

"Bishop's Court, September 18th, 1866.

"My dearest Annie—I have only time for a hurried line.

The Bishop of Graham's Town came yesterday, and at this last moment I have been obliged to put off my Visitation for a week. I am overwhelmed with work. . . . We are in greater perplexities than ever. Just as I had hoped we were likely to have Mr. Cox elected at Natal, I receive a copy of a letter from him to the Archbishop declining the appointment. What now we can do I know not. Happily I have the Bishop of Graham's Town to take counsel with. I think they will elect Butler, and that Butler will not come. We shall, D.V., consecrate whoever they elect. We violate no law of any kind in so doing. The Crown has absolutely no rights whatever in the matter.

"You think it strange that I should tremble when I contemplate my manifold temporal blessings. My public anxieties have been greater than those of most other Bishops, but my family blessings have been greater too. I have not lost a child,—they are all dear children, and improving daily; I have a wife such as few have been blessed with; health, strength, ample means,—may God make me worthier of His numberless mercies."

The Bishop and Mrs. Gray started, September 25th, for the above-mentioned Visitation, going to Saldanha Bay, S. Helena Bay, Hopefield, and other mission stations. At Clan-William he found Mr. Browning doing very real work among the old settlers; and a very interesting work at Baliergot (*Anglicè*, "the washing-tub"), a little mountain farm which the Bishop had bought the year before, and on which there were 200 people, and 800 within reach.

From Paarl he writes to his son:

"October 17th, 1866.

"We are here on our way home, after a ride of 500 miles over sands and through rocky passes. The work is steadily growing in most places. Only in two I have felt discouraged. Your mother has stood her work well, and so have our horses till yesterday, when my man's horse fell and cut himself, so that I can take him no farther. We hope to reach home

by the end of the week. As I grow old I have more distaste for violent exertion than when younger, but I go through more than most men of my acquaintance can bear, so ought to be thankful. While my horses get a day's rest, I am just going to walk eight miles to a confirmation of coloured people, and consecration of a burial-ground. . . . I hope next mail to hear of your Ordination, and am glad that you have had the retirement of Cuddesden. You speak about the Reformation.—It had its mistakes, but when you come to study the history of the Church from the beginning of the tenth century, and see how largely the Church had become the world, you will not be surprised at any amount of reaction, any loss of faith in the Church on the part of earnest men. The previous irreligion of Popes, Bishops, and the whole Church, is answerable for a great deal that took place at the Reformation. Amidst all our shortcomings God seems to be preparing us to become the revivers of Church life and unity throughout Christendom. All our trials seem to be disciplining us for this, if we only rise up to the duty we are being called to."

To Mrs. Mowbray.

"Paarl, October 17th, 1866.

. . . "Tell John I am glad that he is able to support our Colonial Church Bill, and also that he has work to do as Vice-Under-Secretary for the Home Department. I am heartily glad the Conservatives are in, and I wish them a decade of official life, but (knowing very little to help towards a judgment) I see nothing in Gladstone's course to lower my opinion of him in any way. He has had a difficult post to fill, and I fear lest he should come in at the head of a great Reform party, and be driven farther than he could wish. He is, for weal or for woe, the coming man. I rejoice over Lord Carnarvon's appointment. . . . I have no late news from Natal. The Clergy and Laity were to have met on the 4th to consider the replies of Convocation. But Cox has written to withdraw. S. Oxon now, I think, wishes the Crown to quash Colenso's patent, on the ground of his language about prayer to our Lord; but I, of

course, have nothing to do with this. I have a pamphlet on the subject all but written, but I cannot finish it while travelling daily. Our good Governor has lost his charming wife—they were deeply attached—I feel deeply for him."

The pamphlet alluded to in the above letters was published before the end of the year, under the title of "A STATEMENT relating to facts which have been misunderstood, and to questions which have been raised," etc. etc.; and to a second edition, published the following year, an appendix was added. The main substance of the pamphlet has come forth in the Bishop's private letters. One extract may be useful historically to fill in a gap:—

"Upon the receipt of the replies to the questions put by myself and the Conference of Clergy and Laity at Pietermaritzburg, June 29th, 1865, the Church of Natal met in conference by invitation of the Vicar-General, on October 25 (1866), to consider what its duty might be. I have not yet heard what was the result of their meeting. Dr. Colenso himself, condemned by every portion of the Church which has yet spoken, conscious, one would think, at length, that in no sense can his teaching, especially as to the worship due to our Incarnate Lord, be reconciled with the doctrines of the Church of which he still proclaims himself a Bishop, still holds tenaciously to the title which is by law his, and to the status which it secures to him.

"Can nothing be done, men have asked, without the abandonment of any principle, or of the Church's liberties, to deprive him of this show of authority, which he refuses to surrender? I can do nothing—nothing at least without ignoring my own office—without a condemnation of my own acts, which I still hold to be right and lawful acts; without slighting the Canons of the Church, without compromising, as I believe, the freedom of the Church. But is it so clear that others can do nothing? I do not myself feel sure that the Bishop of London can do anything, though others have thought so, and I am not aware that he has ever taken a legal opinion on the subject. But I

believe all Dr. Colenso's writings have now been published in London; for one volume, at least, of his sermons preached since his return to Natal, is at this time being republished there.

"Feeling so strongly, as the Bishop says he does, that Dr. Colenso is wholly unfit to fill the post of a Bishop of the Church, and disapproving as he does of the course pursued by myself, I venture to invite him to submit Dr. Colenso's writings, if he can lawfully do so, to the examination of an Ecclesiastical Court, and to obtain its decisions upon those writings. If the verdict of such a Court should be that they are not in accordance with the teaching of the Church of England, I should suppose that the Crown could, and would upon petition, cancel Dr. Colenso's letters patent, he having repeatedly expressed his conviction that it has the power to do this, and his readiness to submit to the decision of the Crown.

"The honour of the Church of England, I might also add its very safety, seems to me to demand that matters should not rest where they are; for it is apparently in consequence of the possible legal rights which Dr. Colenso might have with regard to the Church of England that the Bishops of the Province of Canterbury hesitated distinctly to say that the Church of England held no communion with him. Knowing what communion means—that it implies spiritual oneness—union of the closest kind—and that the holding of the Queen's letters patent by Dr. Colenso prevents the Church from saying that such union does not exist with one who denies that our Incarnate God ought to be adored, there is surely a call for the only Bishop of the Church who can apparently move in the matter, if he can do so, to submit the writings which have caused so great a scandal, and are bringing such heavy reproach upon the Church, to a court of law. The question is one which no longer affects this portion of the Church. Dr. Colenso is not in communion with it. No human power will be permitted to force him back upon us, unless by God's Grace he should be brought to repentance and to the truth.

"But it is not so, as some of her Bishops say, with the Church of England. Has it not, then, become absolutely neces-

sary that it should be ascertained whether the law compels her to hold communion with heretics? and if it should prove that it does, then she should demand an alteration of the law. There are many who will wait with deep anxiety till some decision is arrived at as to the course to be pursued, under the avowals that have been made; many who have loved to think that God was training, through His chastening discipline, the Church of England to be a mighty blessing to this earth—to become the centre round which all who love Christ and His Truth might gather, under the shadow of the true and primitive constitution of the Church, but which she never can become unless she holds and maintains the Faith of Christ above all earthly trappings and treasures; and requires all who teach with her authority, or claim to be in communion with her, to proclaim it in all its purity and integrity."

In the latter part of the pamphlet Bishop Gray handles, one by one, and completely disposes of, all the Dean of Westminster's cavillings; some concluding remarks thereupon, as well as a singularly moderate and temperate reply to certain accusations (to which certainly the same adjectives do not apply) of the Bishop of S. David's, being found in the Appendix. At the time the Statement was published Bishop Gray was working, and waiting to hear the result of the Maritzburg conference. He writes to his son—

"Bishop's Court, November 17th, 1866.

"Louisa told us of your Ordination. God make you, my dearest boy, a faithful Priest, and enable you to work long and successfully in your Lord's Vineyard. . . . I daresay your mother will tell you of our four days' trip to Robben Island. I went there to minister to paupers, lunatics, and lepers, last Sunday. We had hard work to get back. Surf-boat rope broke, happily when without its living cargo. We had not made a mile in five hours, beating back, when a steamer came out for us. Your mother is very proud that she was the only one not sick. The Natal mail is not in, but an adverse telegram says the Conference, on October 25th, dif-

fered about the election of a Bishop. Clergy nearly equally divided. Butler elected by a majority of one. Of course he will not come under such circumstances, and I confess that I do not know what is to become of the Diocese. I believe that it will go to pieces. I *cannot* look after it, for I can scarce get through my present work, which, owing to absentees and sickness, is more than usually heavy. All this is the result of the Bishops' course in Convocation, which I believe to be simply suicidal, and well-nigh fatal to the Church. . . . The Bishop of Graham's Town is holding successive meetings of laity to interest them in the question of a Provincial Conference, preparatory to a Provincial Synod. . . . I have my hands just now more than usually full, so must, as you say, shut up."

The Conference above mentioned, of which more detailed reports were soon to arrive, took place on this wise.—On Thursday, October 25th, 1866, it was opened by a celebration in the Cathedral at eight o'clock,—fourteen Clergy and about seventy lay communicants present. Later the Conference assembled for discussion; some followers of Dr. Colenso's intruding, and endeavouring to give to the gathering the character of a general public meeting, an attempt which was firmly and successfully resisted by the Dean. In opening the proceedings, the Dean read extracts from his correspondence with the Metropolitan as to the course he thought the Conference should take. Bishop Gray said, "If you elect amid your difficulties, as I think you will do, it might perhaps be wise to name two or three, and leave the selection from them to the Archbishop of Canterbury or others. I think, under the circumstances, the Bishops of the Province would concur in the act. The way is now clear for you to act. There is no doubt you have a perfect right to do so if you will; and that you will forfeit no privileges which you now enjoy in connection with the Church of England by doing so. Convocation has answered your questions fairly and fully. It throws the responsibility of further action now upon yourselves. The next step *must* be yours. There is nothing more you can fairly ask the Mother Church to do." All those

present (one Clergyman only excepted, the Rev. M. Tonneson, who, it should be said, was a Dane, and had been altogether moulded by Dr. Colenso) stood up and made the following Declaration: —

"We believe, with firm and unhesitating faith, that our Crucified Lord, Very God of Very God, is Adorable, and worthy of all adoration; ever has been, and ever is to be adored, both in heaven and earth. Amen."

A second Declaration was then proposed, and after a suggestion that the word "ever" be omitted had been unanimously rejected, it was made by all present standing as before.

"We, offering our most humble and hearty thanks to Almighty God, Who hath planted, and through many ages upheld in our native land of England, a pure branch of the Holy Catholic Church, do hereby declare the earnest desire of our souls, the grace of God assisting us, so to build up the Church in this land, that we and our children may ever remain in union and communion with the Church of England,—we one with it, it one with us; divided in place, but united in faith, doctrine, discipline, and worship."

A resolution was next passed thanking the Archbishop and Convocation for the replies to their questions touching the election of a Bishop; and then, in a speech of some length, Archdeacon Fearne proposed the following resolution:

"Seeing the Apostle S. Peter, in Acts i. 22, declared there was a necessity to elect one to fill the Apostleship then vacant, and as the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury has declared that we shall not be in any degree separated from the communion of the Church of England by electing a godly and learned man to be consecrated at this time Bishop over us; we do now, praying for guidance from Almighty God, choose a holy man whom we may present to the Metropolitan to be consecrated Bishop over the Church of Natal."

Considerable debate took place over this resolution, which was resumed the day following, the small section of dissentients making great use of the hesitating, halting language of certain of the Bishops in Convocation; but the resolution was carried

by a majority of one among the Clergy, and a large majority of laity.

The next resolution was carried *nem. con.*—"That if the person now elected be hindered from accepting the holy office, the Bishops of Cape Town and Graham's Town be requested to choose, with the concurrence of the Archbishop of Canterbury, a fit and proper person, whom, when canonically consecrated, we hereby bind ourselves to receive as our Bishop." The Dean then announced the name of the Rev. William Butler, Vicar of Wantage, as having been suggested for election, and the Conference adjourned to the Cathedral, two of the Clergy (Mr. Newnham and Mr. Lloyd) absenting themselves. There, before the altar, the electing Clergy made the following Declaration: "I, —— ——, having the fear of God before my eyes, and seeking the welfare and glory of His Church, believing William Butler, Priest, Vicar of Wantage in the Diocese of Oxford, in the kingdom of England, to be, by soundness in the faith, holiness of life, and divine learning, eminently qualified to be appointed Bishop over the Church in Natal, do now and hereby nominate him to that holy office."

The Dean then pronounced that the said Rev. William Butler had been duly elected Bishop, and the evening service proceeded.

The Bishop of Cape Town had been for some time past in communication with Mr. Butler, as the following letter will show:—

"Bishop's Court, April 12th, 1865.

"My dear Mr. Butler—Dr. Pusey has written to me to say that you feel the critical state of things in Natal so keenly, and the call there is for some one to go forth as Pastor to that afflicted flock, that you are willing to come if needed. I bless God for this. I shall be very thankful to see you consecrated as Bishop of the Church there, should Colenso be thrust back on us. I believe that our Lord would be with you, and that by His grace you would be stronger than he. Dr. Pusey's letter was a great relief to my mind. The fear lest one should not be found fitted for the trying and difficult work in that land,

and willing to throw himself into it, has been one of my chiefest anxieties of late. I must not, however, let you commit yourself without knowing all that I can tell you. . . . The endowment will be gone. I have ever given £100 a year to Colenso, and I would do the same to you, if not, as I expect to be, mulcted by the Civil Courts. Little or nothing will be got out of the Diocese. We should have to look to England for income, but I think this would be forthcoming." (Here follow various details as to things and persons.) "This I think is all that I need say at present. If it does not alarm you, I will work towards the question of consecration as earnestly and as rapidly as I can. But you will see that I am beset with difficulties. You will of course be prepared to find that many of the laity will be perplexed, and side with the state Bishop against the Church. The Governor, for instance, though he has no sympathy with Colenso, must do this. Officials will all recognise him. All that you could be sure of would be, first and chiefly, Christ's Presence and Blessing, the sympathies of the Clergy and of the best of the laity. The other religious bodies, if not repelled by the indiscretion of the Clergy, would also be with you. . . . Trusting that it may please God that we may be fellow-workers in Africa, believe me, ever faithfully yours, R. CAPETOWN.

"My Synod has asked me to take steps to found a penitentiary. I have written to Carter to know if he has any Sisters for us. We want two, but have as yet raised no funds. Have you any? This climate would suit delicate persons, though Cape Town in summer is very warm. We think we could raise an income to maintain a small establishment, but if any have private means, so much the better. We began our Orphanage in this way."

The election of October 26th was officially communicated by the Dean of Maritzburg to the Metropolitan, and by him to the other Bishops of the Province, and to the Primate of England, and to the Bishop-elect, to whom the Metropolitan wrote unofficially:—

To the Rev. WILLIAM BUTLER, Wantage.

"Bishop's Court, November 19th, 1866.

"My dear Mr. Butler—I send you a Natal newspaper containing the account of the meeting of Clergy and lay communicants at Maritzburg. You will see that you were elected their Bishop by a bare majority of Clergy and a large majority of Communicants present at the time. I have since received a mild protest from Colenso's friends and others in D'Urban, against consecrating a Bishop under existing circumstances. I have not received the Dean's official communication, and have not had time to read the discussions through. The Natal mail has only just come in, and the English mail leaves at 1 o'clock. I will write more fully by the next mail.

"You will see that, as the Convocation trumpet uttered an uncertain sound, its voice has been re-echoed in Natal. Had the Synod of the Church of England said, with unfaltering voice, We cannot and dare not hold communion with the arch-heretic; we recognise the spiritual sentence separating him from the peace of the Church,—all had been well. As it is, the tone of both Clergy and Laity in debate is infinitely better than that of your Londons and S. David's' and others. You will seek counsel of God, and judge for yourself how to act. May He of His goodness guide us all aright. You shall have an official letter when I am in a position to write one."

The Bishop-elect referred the question of his acceptance to the Primate and his own Diocesan, whose opinion was given him in the following letter:—

"January 12th, 1867.

"My dear Sir—We have carefully weighed the difficult questions which you have proposed to us, as to your acceptance of your election to the office of a Bishop in South Africa, and we have concluded:—That the decision of the Judicial Committee having determined the position of our Church in South Africa to be that of a voluntary spiritual society, and that the letters patent held by Dr. Colenso confer on him no territorial jurisdiction or authority, there is nothing in his

legal position to prevent the election of a Bishop to preside over them by those of our communion in South Africa, who, with ourselves, hold him to have been canonically deposed from his spiritual office. Considering, then, the post of Bishop to be vacant, and the needs of that district of South Africa to be urgent, we dare not advise you to refuse the call which has reached you. But before we can advise you to accept it, there appear to us to be certain grave doubts which require to be solved. It is evidently of the utmost moment that no room should be left in the action which you are invited to take for creating a schism which would still farther divide and weaken the Church. For the avoidance of so great a danger, it seems to us unusually important that the canonicity of your election should be clear from any reasonable doubt. Now, we perceive—1, That the electing Clergy were a decided minority of the Clergy of the Diocese; 2, That an equal number voted for and against the proceeding to an election; 3, That some of those who opposed proceeding to an election, recorded their refusal to receive a Bishop if he were consecrated as the result of so nearly balanced a vote. These considerations suggest to us the doubt, whether there is, as yet, the proof which you have a right to require—1, That the canonicity of the election is certain; 2, That it will be recognised by the Metropolitan and Suffragans of the Province as canonical; 3, That it will be so recognised by the Church at home.

We farther notice that though a large majority of the lay communicants present voted for the election, yet that they amounted only to twenty-nine, so small a proportion of the whole number of lay communicants in the Diocese that we doubt whether their vote can properly be taken as expressing 'the assent of the laity,' more especially as we do not perceive that they pledged their order to make the needful provision for their Bishop. We advise you, therefore, to suspend your decision until these important questions concerning your election shall have been completely answered. — With earnest prayers to God to lead you in this matter to see and do His Will, we remain, ever yours,

C. T. CANTUAR.
"S. OXON."

Upon receiving this Mr. Butler sent a copy of it to the Dean of Maritzburg, expressing his own inability to accept the office until the difficulties pointed out were removed; and he also did the same by the Metropolitan, who thereupon wrote formally to the Bishops of the Province, asking them to say whether they confirmed the election, and were willing to consecrate;—at the same time instructing Dean Green to obtain from the Clergy of Natal and Zulu Land their matured and ultimate decision as to whether they were prepared to receive Mr. Butler for their Bishop in case he should be consecrated to that office, and at the same time to ask them each to supply a list of their communicants, notifying who were prepared to receive and who to reject Mr. Butler.

To Mr. Butler the Metropolitan wrote:

"February 15th, 1867.

"I think that you have acted quite as one in your position should do, in placing yourself at the disposal of your Bishop and Metropolitan. I shall be quite content with their decision, and believe it to be of God, though if it be adverse, as far as I can see things in Natal must get worse and worse, till the Church breaks up. The Bishop of Oxford wishes to know—1, Whether the Bishops of this Province would fully recognise you? There can be no doubt of this. We will either receive you if consecrated by the Archbishop, or consecrate you on his recommendation. 2, Whether the Clergy of Natal will receive you?" (Here the Bishop enters upon sundry individual details—resulting in the opinion that one of the Clergy would refuse any one set over him; another, though opposed to Dr. Colenso, would have difficulties on the score of Supremacy; a third, though feeling difficulties, would not recognise Dr. Colenso, and would, like the last, be in heart with the new Bishop; and a fourth would be bothered by his people, but quite loyal.) "The general public for a time would be against you, *i.e.* the world, avowedly on grounds of Supremacy; really because Colenso is the representative of the world, and the world hates the Church. You would have comfort only in the Maritzburg

congregations, and at Umzinti. But, like God's servants of old, you would grow stronger day by day, and Colenso weaker. But your witness for Christ would for a long time be a martyrdom. God guide you to a right decision."

The result of these further investigations was conveyed to Mr. Butler by the Metropolitan in the following letter:—

"Bishop's Court, April 16th, 1867.

"My dear Mr. Butler—I informed you by the last mail of my intention to send a circular to the Clergy of Natal, requesting them to intimate to me whether they accepted you as their Bishop or not; and to furnish me with a list of their communicants, distinguishing between those who acknowledged you, and those who would not. I did not myself write to Mr. ——, because he had repudiated the authority of the Metropolitan as well as of Dr. Colenso, wishing, for good reasons, to be under no one; but I told the Dean that *he* could do so. It seems that he did not. Of course I did not write to Mr. Tonnessen, who is himself excommunicate by communicating with Dr. Colenso; nor to Mr. ——, a Clergyman without license, who left (on account of drunkenness) the Diocese of Graham's Town without testimonials; nor to Gray, who has just been dismissed by Government from a school in S. Helena and has no testimonials, and has gone expressly to join Colenso. There are seventeen Clergy in all whom we can recognise as in communion with the Church. Of these, twelve are prepared heartily to welcome you as their Bishop. One, ——, who cannot remain long, has sent no answer. Four—Callaway, Newnham, Tozer, and I suppose Lloyd—decline. All except the last decline unwillingly, and from scruples about the Royal Supremacy and Colenso's possession of letters patent. . . . As to the Laity, nearly 300 communicants cordially welcome you, 50 wish not to express any opinion, 12 decline to receive you. . . . Of course I cannot say positively what the whole number of communicants in the Diocese may be, but, *including all who openly communicate with Colenso,* I do not myself believe that there are 100 who would repudiate you. I do not say

that this represents the state of feeling in the outside world. I find it very difficult to estimate that, but I think you have now fairly before you the voice of the living Church. I read all the documents which I have received by this mail. You will see by them that notice of your election was read in eight churches, and the congregations appealed to to state objections, if they had them. At one place only, where the people were chiefly Wesleyans, five objected on the ground of your being a High Churchman. You have now the whole case before you as regards the Diocese. . . . Personally the Bishop of Graham's Town would prefer the new Bishop being a coadjutor to the Metropolitan, and he thinks that Dr. Pusey concurred in this view. I cannot say that I do. The See is vacant, or it is not. If it is, the new Bishop should be Bishop of the Diocese; if it is not, I have no right to send a deputy there. Indeed under no circumstances does it seem to me we could canonically consecrate a Coadjutor Bishop to take charge of that Diocese. . . . I am writing to the Archbishop to say that in response to his Grace's summons I purpose, D.V., to sail for England by the June steamer. There must, therefore, I fear, be delay in your coming out, should you consent to do so. Once in England, I cannot say when I can leave, for the inability of S. P. G. to grant what is absolutely necessary to keep up my work will compel me to give some time to the raising of funds. You will see that Colenso has cited the Dean, Archdeacon Fearne, and Mr. Walton, to appear before him. They will take no notice, and he will deprive them all. His attempt to thrust —— upon S. Andrew's congregation failed, but he will try again, and the Court will back him up in everything. Judge Connor, you will see, joins in inviting you to come. . . I am afraid that I am in for an appeal on the subject of the title to Church property. I understand, however, that the Privy Council will allow the question to stand over for months. I shall, therefore, do nothing till I reach England. I presume that after Colenso deprives the Clergy he will apply to the Court to turn them out; that it will do so, and then they must appeal. I have suggested that, without acknowledging him, they may checkmate

him by telling him that they appeal to the Metropolitan to protect them against his pretended sentence. His own lawyers told him that they had an appeal to me, and he published their opinion. I don't think that the Dean will consent to the possible appearance of a recognition, and I believe that the Supreme Court, if Colenso referred the point to it, would override the appeal; the men are reckless in their partisanship. You can show this letter to the Archbishop and the Bishop of Oxford. I cannot write fully to them, having only this one day for my whole English correspondence. Praying, my dear friend, that our God may guide you to a right decision, I remain ever, faithfully and affectionately yours, R. CAPETOWN."

After the second appeal to the Diocese and Province had been made known to them, the Archbishop and Bishop of Oxford wrote to Mr. Butler as follows:—

"Rev. and dear Sir—The communications which have passed between ourselves and the Metropolitan Bishop of Cape Town, and the Bishops of Graham's Town and the Orange River Territory, at length enable us to answer the important questions which you have proposed to us. We are of opinion —I. That you are duly elected and chosen by a large majority of the Clergy and lay communicants, members of the Church of England resident within the territory of Natal, to be their Bishop and chief pastor, with your See at Pietermaritzburg. II. We have ascertained that the Bishops of South Africa, who are in communion with the Church of England, are ready to confirm your election and act upon it, on being assured of your acceptance of the same. C. T. CANTUAR.

"S. OXON."

We have somewhat anticipated matters, in order to keep this correspondence together, and must now look back a little. Important events to the Church crowded so rapidly one upon the other at that time, that it is hard to keep pace with them. The case known as *Colenso* v. *Gladstone and Others*—in which Dr. Colenso sued the Council of the Colonial Bishoprics Fund

for his salary, had been argued in June 1866; when the Attorney-General, on behalf of the Treasurers of that Fund, maintained that the arrangements made by the founders of the Fund in 1841, assumed that the Crown would have created legal Bishoprics, with legal Dioceses and ecclesiastical power, but that this having been denied by the late Privy Council Judgments, the Bishop of Natal was merely a titular Bishop with no ecclesiastical position at all, and consequently he was without the pale of such Bishops as those endowments provided for. Mr. Selwyn argued on the same side, as also Mr. Wickens and Mr. Pemberton. Messrs. James, Stephens, and Karslake, on the contrary, pleaded, on behalf of Bishop Colenso, that the Bishop of Natal was created by the Crown expressly on the promise of an endowment from the Colonial Bishopric Fund; that he was appointed on the faith of it; that he was still Bishop of Natal *de facto*, and had done nothing to deprive himself of the benefit of the endowment; and that the Council and Treasurer were not justified in withholding payment. The Master of the Rolls, Lord Romilly, gave judgment in this case on November 6th.[1] The immediate effect of this judgment was to order the payment of Dr. Colenso's salary, but other and much more weighty issues were opened by it, greatly affecting the Colonial Churches. Apparently this judgment put them and their Bishops back to the position they held before the late Privy Council Judgment—their Dioceses being legally constituted, their Bishops lawful Bishops —themselves part of the Church of England. The only difference Lord Romilly saw between Colonial and English Bishops was that they had no coercive jurisdiction. Lord Westbury had toppled over their whole fabric; Lord Romilly stuck them up again for the next Privy Council to play at ninepins with! But we will let Bishop Gray give his own definition and character of the judgment, which he received by the mail of December 17th, and, at the first glance, pronounced that it could not be worse, though he had not had time to go through it and forecast consequences.

On that same day he wrote to the Bishop of Oxford:

[1] The Judgment will be found in a volume of Charges and Documents shortly to be published.

"Bishop's Court, December 17th, 1866.

"My dear Bishop—Your letter of October 8th has just reached me, and with it the Rolls Judgment. I have but a moment either to study the Judgment or to write, for the mails, both to England and Natal, leave in a few hours, and I am overwhelmed with work. First—As to the Judgment. From the glance I have been able to take of it, it appears to me intended simply to bring all Colonial Churches under the heel of the State, and place lay Judges over Colonial Bishops. It ignores the very existence of Provinces and Metropolitans; and compels the exercise of all discipline through lay courts, and ultimately through the Privy Council, thereby destroying discipline, in consequence of the great expense. It seems to me most artfully framed to crush out all life and liberty from our Churches, and to court the lay desire to place the ultimate government of the Church in lay hands. Its aim is to withdraw lay support from Bishops in Colonies, and it will, to a great extent, succeed in this, because it directly appeals to their inclination to resist spiritual authority. It appears to me that either there must be an appeal to the House of Lords, or an Act of Parliament based upon different principles. But I confess that I have no hope of this. I believe this Judgment, more than any preceding ones, will be productive of disorders, dissensions, schisms in the Colonial Churches; because there are very many prepared for *any* alternative, rather than see the Church under the government of the Privy Council. Will this lead the Archbishop to move in the direction of the National Synod? I hope so. . . . I never thought your vindication of me cold! and I quite feel that you should not appear, in the eyes of the Church or the world, a mere partisan. Do not trouble yourself about such matters. We have a work before us enough to task us to the uttermost. I will not say that I am not sensitive; but I trust that I am ready to sacrifice fair fame, or anything but truth and honesty, for that which is the cause of Christ."

A few days after he wrote to the Bishop of Graham's Town:

"I have been thinking what we ought to do about this most impudent Judgment? Do you think that we ought to take any public step? If so, what? when? I am afraid that we could not meet in time to influence the British Parliament or Government. If we Bishops soon meet, should Clergy meet too? I have written a long letter on the Judgment for publication. I have shown it to no one yet. If I can, I should like to show it to you, and your Dean and Archdeacon, to Clergy here, and Watermeyer, if he would consider it, and send it to England by the next mail. I have taken up these two points:—

"I. The existence of English law in the Colonial Churches.

"II. The revolutionary line with regard to their constitution. Romilly breaks up Provinces, substitutes independency, makes the Supreme Court and Privy Council actual Courts of Appeal, against the view of Lord Lyndhurst. His inconsistencies are very great. No law is more clear in the Church of England than that which fixes its Provincial character. The final court he gives us is not that which Parliament has given to the Church of England. I am persuaded that all he says about our being bound by English ecclesiastical law is moonshine—rests upon no foundation but the *sic volo*. Will you work this out in your mind, and correct my document when I send it? I am not satisfied with my paper—one ought not to have to write upon these grave subjects in a hurry."

And on December 30th he wrote again to the Bishop:—

"I have been strongly advised by several of the Clergy, who have read my letter, to put it forth at once here, because —— and —— have concocted a petition to Parliament, praying that the Privy Council may be declared our Court of Appeal, and are privately soliciting good Churchmen to sign it. I fully expected that judgment would lead to some such movement. It appeals directly to the laity, who wish to have lay government over the Church; and it pretty plainly affirms that in adopting the title recommended by the Committee of Convocation, we have seceded from the Church of England. The Clergy here think that on Archdeacon Thomas's return from Caledon ten days

hence, they must face a public meeting and discuss the whole question as to the status of the Church, including the subject of appeals. I am very sorry that I must publish my letter without having the benefit of your criticisms, for it touches upon many delicate points. I have sent it to Judge Watermeyer, and hope to discuss it with him. *P.S.*—I have had a three hours' talk with him, and have assented to his criticisms."

To the BISHOP of GRAHAM'S TOWN.

"Bishop's Court, January 7th, 1867.

"My dear Bishop—Since the appearance of the Rolls Judgment I am more than ever perplexed as to the course to be pursued. As your Diocesan Synod is due, probably the calling it is the right step for you. But you will see that some of our people have printed their petition, and as it is plausible, and meets the prejudices of laity, it *may* be largely signed. I cannot get my Letter through the press at this time of year for a day or two more. But I preached on the subject in the Cathedral yesterday. The Clergy of the Archdeaconry of George are now in Session. I believe they mean to petition both Houses of Parliament, and to address both Lord Carnarvon and the Bishops, and to protest against the interference with their rights and with the constitution of their Church which Lord Romilly's Judgment implies, and some ask for. I am very much inclined to suggest this course to the Clergy here, for it is at their liberties that the blow is struck. Do you think that we can do anything in this direction? We shall probably have a general meeting for discussion, but these gentlemen have got the start of us by their petition. I say openly, that the principles of Lord Romilly's Judgment, if adopted, can only lead to divisions. . . . I propose by this mail to address Lord Carnarvon officially, and with reference to the petition, first give him copies of the Resolutions, both of the Provincial and Diocesan Synods, and, while expressing the satisfaction with which we should see our rights as a voluntary association recognised by Parliament, protest against that interference with any constitutional rights which legislation for us by the British Parliament would in-

volve. . . . I think that we are in for discussion now, and that we must go through with it."

During this time various meetings of more or less weight, to which the Bishop alludes, were being held in the South African Church, on the subject of the Master of the Rolls' Judgment, which excited the keenest amazement and indignation in every direction; but, as was strongly affirmed at the time, the effect was on the whole good, for it concentrated men's minds, which were in danger of running out into an endless variety of opinions and suggestions, upon two main points—*i.e.* the assertion of the South African Church's independence, and her preservation in the Unity of the Faith and in Communion with the Mother Church. The Bishop's published letter appeared, as we have seen, in the early days of January 1867, and it certainly appeared to most Churchmen to be a virtual upsetting of Lord Romilly's judicial affirmations. After explaining that so far he had held back, wishing rather to gather the views of others than to put forth his own, the Metropolitan went on to say, that believing the Master of the Rolls' Judgment eminently calculated to mislead men's minds in very grave matters, he could not lightly remain silent. That document was rather a treatise on the position of the Colonial Church than a judgment. Happily no part of it was law, save that which declared that the non-existence of jurisdiction on the part of Colonial Bishops was not to be followed by the loss of their endowments. The argumentative part only contained the reasons which had weighed with the individual Judge in framing his sentences, and was binding on no one. The Metropolitan had no intention of meddling with the sentence itself, and certainly had no reason to complain of it, inasmuch as it restored to him, as well as to Dr. Colenso, his ecclesiastical income, which had been withheld for nearly two years. But he was constrained to deal with the theory propounded and the principles involved. The Metropolitan felt grateful for the great clearness with which Lord Romilly had brought out the distinct spiritual character and powers of the Church of Christ; but, on the other hand, he had laid down maxims upon two very vital points, which, if ac-

cepted, would prove fatal to the wellbeing, and, at no very distant day, to the being, or at least to the unity of Colonial Churches. I. As to the law now existing among these Churches. Hitherto it had been carried into distant lands by Churchmen, *foro conscientiæ;* neither they nor their Bishops carried any law with them except for themselves; but the Master of the Rolls affirmed (only on his own assertion, he produced no confirming law) that all—Bishops, Clergy, and laity—were bound to adhere, not only to the Bible and Prayer Book, as received by the Church of England, but to all (or rather inconsistently, almost absurdly, *not* to *all* but to some) of the statute laws enacted in past or future for the Church of England, and to the headship of the Queen. "We are," he says, "bound by such of these laws as are suited to our circumstances, and if we do not abide by them we forfeit our connection with the Mother Church." But who was to decide what was and what was not suited to these circumstances? Not the Church or the Bishop, according to Lord Romilly, but the Civil Court, where a Jew or Mahometan might be called to decide what are the Church's laws, what they mean, and even what its faith is!—"In reality to legislate for us, and very probably overrule the judgment of the Bishop in matters purely Christian. Can anything well be more monstrous? He is to decide what religion is to be taught in our churches, and the Church itself is to be helpless in the matter, for it is not to have the power of defining or amending its own laws. It must submit to this anomalous state of things, it must be content to work with an indefinite amount of English statute law hanging ever loosely about it; or cease, according to Lord Romilly, to be in connection with the Church of England. But you have admitted as much, says the Judge. It is a fundamental doctrine with you that the Queen is the head of your Church, that all your discipline centres in her; you must accept at her hands what she rules to be your status and your faith. Now, Lord Romilly knows as well as most men, that when Henry VIII. assumed this title, which belongs of right to Him Who Alone is Head of the Church, which is His Body, he extorted it from Convocation under threat of persecution—

under penalties of *præmunire;*—that even then the Clergy insisted on qualifying the hateful term with the proviso *quantum per Christi legem licet;* that nothing short of actual confiscation of their property, and imprisonment, coerced them to submission; that a Court of Equity would hardly rule that a man ordinarily would be bound by admissions wrung from him under such circumstances; that Queen Elizabeth repudiated the usurped title; that no law either of Church or State confers it on the Crown; that it appeared in Reformation times so awful a title to earnest men, that, though disclaimed by the Church it was a fruitful cause of schisms; that it wounds the consciences of Christian men in these days as much as in the olden time; and yet, with Lord Westbury, he deliberately applies it to the Church of England. . . . He says it is part of our Faith! and is taught in the 37th Article. That Article affirms no more than this: That the jurisdiction—*i.e.* the legal coercive powers which the Pope claimed in England,—the setting up by a foreign Prelate and Potentate of Courts (in the full sense of the word) within the kingdom of another independent Sovereign, an *imperium in imperio,* had no foundation in right or law,—that to the Crown 'the chief government of all estates of this realm, whether they be ecclesiastical or civil, in all causes doth appertain, and is not, nor ought to be, subject to any foreign jurisdiction.' I say the same. 'Causes' are matters contested before courts of law with legal jurisdiction. Neither Pope nor Bishop has a right to establish such courts in the Queen's dominions. In all courts of the realm everything must run in the Queen's name. Her authority is paramount in them. They are the Queen's Courts; their decisions are her decisions. But this has nothing to do with the tribunals which voluntary religious associations may set up as their *forum domesticum.* If Lord Romilly had wished to deal fairly with the Church, he should have quoted those other words of the 37th Article: 'We give not to our princes the ministering either of God's Word or of the Sacraments, but *that only prerogative which we see to have been given always to all godly princes in Holy Scripture by God Himself.*' All Christians are, I suppose, prepared to admit this."

The Metropolitan went on to show that Lord Romilly would take away what the Long Judgment granted—that he identified the Church with the Establishment—confounded it with the State to which it is allied. In the Colonies the State has declined to establish the Church, and consequently the latter is not hampered with its laws; but it is not separated from the Church of England because the Establishment is not an essential, but a mere accident of the position of that Church, and the Colonial Church is united to it in all that is essential—its succession, its faith, its formularies. Lord Romilly does not attempt to prove that the Queen's mandate transfers English Ecclesiastical law to the Colonies; and the Metropolitan claimed freedom and independence for the voluntary religious associations so resolutely proclaimed by the Judicial Committee!

He went on to show that whatever rights—"territorial See" or "legal Diocese"—letters patent gave a Bishop, they also of necessity gave to a Metropolitan; and that the judgment in setting this aside was both inconsistent and revolutionary—inconsistent, for, having affirmed that "all laws" of the Church of England were binding in Colonial Churches, it annihilates one of the more fundamental, viz. that all Suffragan Bishops are in some Province and subject to their Metropolitan. "If we are to have English law in all things, why not here? In England we have Metropolitans. Why, if we are the same Church, having had them once appointed in Africa, are they to be destroyed there? In England appeals lie by law from the Suffragan to the Court of the Metropolitan. Why are they not to lie here?—etc. etc. Grave consequences cannot but result from an act of so much injustice. The immediate fruits are—

"I. The destruction both of the spiritual character of the Church and of its actual constitution, by the annihilation of its spiritual tribunals.

"II. The fencing and screening of Dr. Colenso, and through him of all unbelief, from all control save that which Civil Courts may be pleased to exercise."

He next shows the revolutionary character of the judgment

in the matter of appeals, overthrowing the laws of the Church of England, the very system of the Church as it has been, if not from Apostolic times, "certainly long before the Council of Nice, as appears from its Sixth Canon, and substituting, without the slightest warranty of law, a system of government over the Church by Civil Courts, which are not to confine their jurisdiction to the true office and functions of a Civil Court in matters spiritual, that is, to give legal effect and consequence to the decisions of Spiritual Courts, unless there be reason to suspect *mala fides* in those Courts . . . . but to be above the Spiritual Courts for all the purposes for which they exist,—to be Courts of Appeal from their determinations, and entitled to revise all their decisions, precisely as the Metropolitical Court in England revises or overrules the decisions of the Diocesan Courts. If this be so, I have a right to say that Lord Romilly subverts the system, canons, laws of the Church, on a matter of universal obligation, essential to the very life of the Church. He destroys, as far as it is in his power to do, not the liberties of the Church only, but the Church itself, and turns it into a mere department of the State."

The Metropolitan proceeded to show how Lord Romilly contradicted a celebrated judgment of Lord Lyndhurst (*in re* Warren), in which he expressly affirmed that the Civil Court has no right to go into the merits of a case. After going at some length into this part of the recent judgment, the Metropolitan goes on to say: "We have seen what evils have already resulted in England through the definition of the Faith of the Church by Civil Judges. Against the remonstrance of both Archbishops, it has been declared that men may teach within the Establishment that the Bible is not the Word of God—that the decisions of the Judge in the Great Day are not final and everlasting. And 10,000 of the Clergy, with the two Archbishops at their head, have been compelled to protest against a decision which has misrepresented the Faith of the Church of England, and gone far to obscure and compromise her character as a witness for the Faith, and to rob her of two Articles of the Faith. The question which has been raised is one of the

deepest moment. It touches the conscience very nearly in matters relating to God and His Revealed Truth. For my own part, I say that I never can consent to submit the deepest questions of the Faith to the decision of such a Court. . . . If any change is to be made" (in the order and constitution of the Church), "let it be made by a free National Council. I submit myself entirely to the decisions of the Church so assembled, in this and every other matter. But I repudiate, and repudiate with a conviction so deep and a determination so fixed that I cannot measure or express it, the substitute now sought to be forced upon us, which breaks up our organisation as a Province, destroys our connection with the patriarchal See of Canterbury, places the final decision as to what our faith is or shall be entirely in the hands of Civil Judges, reduces each Bishop to the position of a mere officer of the State, a policeman under the government of the day, and could not but end in the breaking up into distinct separate Churches the now united Churches in the Colonies."

Going on to foreshadow the hideous evils liable to result from such a course as Lord Romilly would lead to, the Metropolitan affirmed that "a stand must be made somewhere, and if not made now and here, I know not where it could be made. If we ask to have the Privy Council for our final court of appeal, we bind ourselves to abide by its decisions in all matters relating to the Faith, and we must be prepared, bit by bit, to surrender our whole faith. But why, if this be so, some say, does not the Church of England define her views afresh, so distinctly that Civil Judges cannot misapprehend or misinterpret them? I reply, first, that she has already done this sufficiently for any candid mind; and next, that practically it is impossible, for no new definitions of hers would be binding in the Law Courts, unless made law by an Act of Parliament; and, constituted as the House of Commons is, of Churchmen, Romanists, Quakers, Jews, and Dissenters of every form of opinion, it would be hopeless to expect its assent to any fresh definition of the faith of the Church of England. All that she can do is to speak by her own constitutional organ, the Convo-

cation, and this she has done. It is because of this great wrong done to the Church of England against her vehement reclamation, and because we see that there is no security against the gradual change, by repeated decisions, of the whole faith of the Church as a Church, that very many feel constrained (and I rank myself among the number) to resist at all costs and hazards, be these what they may, the imposition of the Privy Council yoke upon the neck of Colonial Churches. We believe that in submitting to it, we should risk the betrayal of God's Revealed Truth, and surrender the custody of those mysteries of which we are the appointed stewards. It is for this reason—because the question really involved is that of faithfulness to Christ and His Written Word, or abandonment of His Truth—that we hold ourselves in conscience bound to resist the contemplated invasion of our office."

These points are expanded and enlarged upon, and the Metropolitan concludes with the expression of his belief that, though troubled times, ours are also hopeful times, and that the deep life stirring within the Church of England is perhaps preparing her for a work of greater depth and extent than we may venture to imagine.

On the 18th January, 1867, Bishop Gray, sending this Pastoral to his brother, wrote as follows concerning it:—

"That Judgment has caused some stir here. I wrote, because Mr. Long and two of his violent friends got up a petition to Parliament, praying for no alteration in the Church of England in the Colonies, and trying to throw dust in people's eyes. I took the chair at a large meeting in Cape Town, at which a resolution to the same effect was proposed, and an amendment moved. Only five hands were held up against the amendment; which asks Parliament, *if* it legislates (which would be unconstitutional), to legislate on the principles of L. P.'s, not on those of Rolls Judgment, and invites the Archbishop to call a National Council. The petition was not well signed, but is being hawked about the streets. At Graham's Town they have just telegraphed a resolution, adopted by 400 Churchmen, denouncing Secular Courts for keeping Bishops and Clergy who

deny the faith in their posts. The Archdeaconry of George has been in conference; they have adapted an excellent petition, and passed some strong resolutions. The laity would denounce the Bishop of London for his treatment of me.

"All this excitement is very trying; there seems no end of it. Blow comes after blow, and men commit themselves to false principles without in the least understanding the points at issue. The Bishop of London (Dr. Tait)[1] has been very impertinently addressing not only all Colonial Bishops, but their Clergy, on questions at issue. He will get well snubbed, for the Clergy are very indignant, and say that they should have been addressed by the Archbishop through their own Bishops. I have sent copies of my replies to him to the Archbishops and to S. Oxon, and have written in the name of the Synod of this Church fully and formally to Lord Carnarvon. Things are much *in statu quo* at Natal. Judgment has not been given in Colenso's suit against me. It is said that he is preparing to eject the Dean from his Cathedral. Lord Romilly has done his best to split up the Colonial Churches. The Clergy almost to a man, would refuse to be ministers of a Church founded on the principles he has laid down. They would call themselves the Church of the Ranters, Jumpers, Muggletonians, or any other hateful name, to escape the tyranny and oppression which he would propose for them; and they would proclaim to the world that the aggressive judgments of Secular Courts had forced them to assume a title they hated, instead of one which they loved.

"The Governor has written me a nice letter, proposing a scheme which he thinks would get us out of the difficulty Lord Romilly would get us into. He proposes our successive Courts should be, I. Suffragan; II. Metropolitan; III. Patriarch (in each case *forum domesticum*); IV. Supreme Court; V. Privy Council. Five Courts for every poor Colonial Clergyman with

[1] "In the midst of all this, the Bishop of London, impertinently enough, intrudes into the Diocese, and sends printed circulars to the Clergy about the Bill he wishes to introduce into Parliament; and this adds to our perplexities, for he plainly intimates that he wants what he knows the Bishops are opposed to."—*Letter* (*to Miss Cole*), January 31st, 1867.

£200 a year, and each poor Bishop with £800! There could be no discipline in such case. I tell him the Clergy will never consent to alter the system laid down in the L. P. until altered by a free National Council. We know we can only (except in Crown Colonies) have a *forum domesticum*, but we insist upon it, as Long Judgment affirmed, that the *forum domesticum* shall stand in the same relation to Civil Courts as in the case of Wesleyans, and that the principles laid down by Lord Lyndhurst, which Privy Council has over and over again said it will abide by, shall be maintained. If this is not allowed us the Colonial Churches will break away from the Mother Church, and will break up among themselves within five years. I showed my MS. to Judge Watermeyer before I published; he said the argument was irrefragable. I believe the Chief Justice agrees. Of course they are not bound to my platform."

Writing on the same subject a little later (February 5th, 1867), the Bishop says: "It is very hard to have common half-educated laymen forced to consider questions of such deep moment, without any previous training or preparation. And it is harder still to have to argue them into a right course, against the decisions of Law Courts, and the suggestions of the Bishop of London; especially as we (I above all) lie open to the imputation freely cast upon me that I argue for my own power, that I wish to make myself Pope of an independent Church. I trust that the English Parliament will say, Begone, be free, do not trouble us; and that the Archbishop will call together the National Synod. No other body than that can preserve the Churches in unity."

To the Rev. the Hon. Henry Douglas.

"January 30th, 1867.

"I sent you by the last mail my Pastoral. Our Evangelicals in hot haste went in for the Romilly Judgment, and committed themselves to a petition. Now they are beginning to open their eyes, and to see that they have been asking for what they do not want. Meantime both Dioceses are moving in a right direction, and we shall, I think, speak on the whole with

no 'uncertain sound.' . . . I see the *Record* charges me and the Bishop of Oxford with forcing on Colenso's consecration in spite of its warnings. The facts are these:—He had published a volume of Village Sermons,—the *Record* declared that in them he had denied the eternity of punishment. He published a pamphlet to show that the charge was wholly untrue, which he did by numerous quotations, and he affirmed his belief in the doctrine as the Church holds it. The pamphlet or letter was addressed to Archbishop Sumner. He declared himself perfectly satisfied. Neither I nor the Bishop of Oxford had anything to do with his decision. The *Record* was inaccurate and unjust, but we must give it the credit of having scented out the odour of heresy. Nearly all Colenso's friends whom he took me to visit were Evangelicals, and some of them were leading men." . . .

It was a weary, dispiriting time; and though the Bishop kept up his brave unselfish heart throughout, there were periods when he felt it very keenly so to be. From Kalk Bay, where he had gone for a week's rest in the great heat of February 1867, he wrote to his son: "I hear that the Natal Judges, the only respectable one dissenting, have pronounced that all Church property in that Colony vested in the See of Cape Town is really vested in the See of Natal. Not a little of this I have bought. You can look for no honest verdict from lawyers in matters relating to religion,—that is a settled axiom with me. They are always biassed. I have now to appeal, at a vast cost, probably to be beaten again. I shall leave the decision on this point with the Bishop of Oxford. Things have gone of late against us. But 'the Lord's Arm is not shortened—Christ reigneth.' I am not disheartened, but I am very weary. It seems as if there were never to be an end to contention and turmoil; as if there were to be not merely no rest for this troubled Church, but not even breathing time." It was a rest to the Bishop to turn from his own cares and troubles to his son's developing work and interests.

"If —— and —— would read some of our seventeenth-

century divines, they would get more solid theology out of them than the modern, and without the taint of present controversies. I think that if men lose sight of themselves and teach principles their work would be lasting. If your people act in a certain way to please you, or because they like you, you will do them but little good. Of course personal influence must always have weight, and is valuable as an element for good; but the work of popular men is often shallow and sometimes a failure, because they do not look quite away from themselves, and insensibly lead others to look to them. Sound Churchmen have an easier path in this matter than Evangelicals. I mean that their system leads and compels them to look to principles and authority more than to individual influence. Therefore their responsibility as to fruits is greater. I agree with you in thinking that we hardly teach Church doctrine enough, and that in existing circumstances it is often done more effectually by catechising than from the pulpit. Of our mixed congregations it is true now as of old, 'neither yet are ye able to bear it.' They have not yet mastered 'the first principles of the doctrine of Christ.'"

Again, March 17th, 1867 . . . "I do not believe that dogma is learnt from sermons; it must be got either through reading or catechising. I think that there should be public catechising in every church (we have little enough here). Our people have no definite faith for want of this. If pains were taken with it, and the children prepared for it, and a running comment made upon it, parents would be interested and come and learn, while professedly hearing how their children acquitted themselves. Had public catechising been general in the Church, our people's faith had been clearer, deeper, more defined. School catechising will train you to be a Catechist in church. I have great doubts as to the extent to which what some would call controversial preaching should be carried into the pulpit. People don't understand the subject, and half are offended at it. . . . Do not suppose that I wish to keep dogma out of the pulpit—far from it; but I think we must avoid preaching it in a bare, dry, abstruse way, and try to show the bearing which each

truth revealed has upon the life of the soul. In this way truth may commend itself, which, taught merely as part of the faith needful to be received, would only stir up opposition. We must put truth before people in the least offensive way. You say you preached on the point that there is 'no true ministry save by Apostolical succession.' Is not that unnecessarily irritating and antagonistic? Why not teach the truth positively, and not add negatives? Show that our Lord founded a Church, and what its constitution from the first was. Leave to the hearers to draw the inference, which, if you put it bluntly before them, would only put up their backs. . . . ——— says that you are overtaxing yourself; I think this very probable. Remember that you have no right to do this. It is weak and immoral to do so. God has given you certain powers of mind and body, you have no right to become a spendthrift as regards these. I do not think that you get rest or change enough, and you should go away oftener from the parish; if you do not, some fine day you will find that you cannot go on, and that it would have been a wise economy to have taken a run more often. It is mere vanity to suppose that your work will not go on without you. . . . Do not dwell in your ministerial work too much upon Church questions. It is true that we have not taught them enough, but if you are ever harping upon them, you will irritate, and your people will feel that you are giving them husks to feed upon rather than the true Bread. The essence of all teaching, and that around which all should centre, is the Person and work of our Lord. I think, as the religious life deepens in your own soul, you will feel this. Men far advanced in the religious life can speak with more weight about these questions than very young men. I would not overlook them, but keep them in their proper place. Do not let the idea grow up in people's minds that you value the shell rather than the spiritual food which it contains."

About the same time the Bishop, writing to Miss Cole, says: "We cannot throw ourselves into all the ritual question which is so agitating the Church, seeing that we cannot measure the extent to which it has gone. I remember the copes hang-

ing up in Durham Cathedral in the place where they had been used in Cosin's time. They were afterwards removed to the College Library. I should be for allowing a great latitude in these matters, though I do not like an elaborate ritual myself."

Looking to a journey to England in 1868, the Bishop was making arrangements for a Visitation first, and preparing to leave his Province in as much tranquillity as possible, amid the endless distractions, movements and counter-movements, resulting from the unhappy state of the Church in Natal. All his plans, however, were altered by the Archbishop's summoning the Council of Bishops, generally known as the Pan-Anglican Synod, at a much earlier period than had been originally looked for. The formal invitation for September 24th was issued from Lambeth, February 22nd, 1867, and immediately on receiving it the Bishop resolved to sail for England by the June mail, a determination which involved almost more work than even his energetic mind and body could get through. "The dear Archbishop has given us very little time to arrange," he writes, April 18th. "You can scarce conceive how many things require careful consideration, and what a great mess things get into when we leave home. Our poor people alone are a great anxiety, and then horses and servants and fifty other things. . . . I was just preparing for a long Visitation, to be ready to go to England next year, and we have a great deal of unfinished work throughout the Diocese."

To the BISHOP of OXFORD.

"May 16th, 1867.

"I venture to send you a copy of Resolutions which embody my views as to what would be desirable conclusions for the General Synod to arrive at. I have not forwarded them to the Archbishop, because I thought that it might be presumptuous to do so. I know, however, that you will not misunderstand me. I have no intention to move them all, they are merely my rough thoughts, and my contribution to the stock of subjects for discussion. I am greatly afraid that we shall be hampered for want of time. When one thinks how

various are the subjects which will be mooted, how numerous the speakers, and divergent the opinions, and for how long a time the ancient Councils sat, one cannot but dread lest at the end of four days very little progress will have been made.

"I earnestly hope that there will be ample opportunity afforded for many informal meetings before the appointed days, that things may take shape, and the greater number of us may let off superfluous steam."

Up to the last moment Dr. Colenso was harassing the Church to the utmost of his power—applying to the Civil Court for an interdict to prevent Clergy from officiating without his license; attempting to deprive the Dean, Archdeacon, and Mr. Walton of Pinetown, etc. etc.; and even venturing to send an attorney's letter to the Metropolitan demanding £329 for arrears, with interest, of his private subscription of £100 a year, which, being given for the benefit of the Church of Natal, Bishop Gray necessarily discontinued upon Dr. Colenso's deposition. The lawyers advised that all these proceedings should be left unnoticed, and treated with contempt; but they were infinitely harassing and vexatious, and the kind heart of the Bishop was sorely pained at the unworthy conduct of one whom he would fain have respected, if he could not commend him. "Poor fellow! he has sunk very, very low," is the harshest judgment wrung from the Metropolitan. But he was sorely anxious as to the Erastian, vacillating line to which a part of the Church at home seemed disposed to commit her, and often reasserted his opinion that the Church of England would not last unless she asserted her position as the Kingdom of our Lord in England;—and that the questions really at issue were, "Whether our Lord has a Kingdom upon earth; and what claim the State has to assert that she is such, or act as if she were?"

Nevertheless, as he said to his son, "Do not get *hot* on Church questions; all will come right in God's good time."

The Bishop and Mrs. Gray sailed in the "Briton," June 20th, for England. Before embarking he celebrated in the Cathedral, and all the Clergy within reach joined in the Holy Communion.

After service, a short warm address to the Bishop was signed by all present, bidding him God-speed. "The Lord prosper you;—we wish you good luck in the Name of the Lord. May Almighty God, and His Son our Lord Jesus Christ, afford you and your brethren the Bishops His continual Grace, and especially may He vouchsafe that whatever is counselled and done by you may be guided and inspired by the Holy Spirit. It is our devout hope that confusion and doubts may be removed, concord and unanimity be promoted, the Catholic Faith upheld, and our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ be honoured and worshipped throughout the world."

The Bishop made a brief reply, his parting words being, "Brethren, pray for us." He had already put forth a very short Pastoral, showing of how great importance the expected Council of Bishops was to the Church at large and all her members, and urging all—both Clergy and laity—to pray instantly that God's Blessing and Guidance might be with them.[1]

In a few lines written to Dean Douglas, off S. Helena (June 27th, 1867), the Bishop says: "We have had fine weather, light breezes, and consequently get on slowly. The ship is comfortable, but we have an intolerable number of screaming children, who bellow from morning to night. Miss —— declares she must jump overboard! . . . The passengers attend daily prayers, and most seem reverent. We are weary enough already of the voyage, and shall be very thankful to have it over."

Having made a short stay at S. Helena—just time to admit of an interview with the Bishop thereof, who, unable

[1] The following prayer was appended to the Pastoral:—

"Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, who hast purchased to Thyself an Universal Church by the Precious Blood of Thy Dear Son, mercifully look upon the same, and guide the minds of Thy servants, the Bishops and Pastors of Thy flock who are to meet together in Thy Name. Be with them: enlighten their hearts by Thy Presence, direct them in their works and ways, and teach them what they ought to do, that by Thy Aid they may please Thee in all things. Assist them with Thy Holy Spirit, that their counsels may contribute to the extension of Thy Kingdom, the maintenance of truth, and the restoration of godly union and concord. And this we pray, through the Merits and Mediation," etc.

to come himself to England, empowered the Metropolitan to act as his proxy—the "Briton" reached Southampton July 2nd, and the Bishop and Mrs. Gray at once proceeded to London, to begin the usual routine of toil which attended his home visits, looked upon, as they might be by some—how mistakenly!—as pleasant holidays.

CHAPTER XI.

JULY, 1867, TO OCTOBER, 1868.

LAND AT SOUTHAMPTON — BISHOP OF OXFORD — MANIFOLD ENGAGEMENTS — DEATH OF JUDGE WATERMEYER — "LESSONS" — LONDON CHURCHES — S. P. G. DAY AT SALISBURY — DISCUSSIONS WITH BISHOPS OF SALISBURY AND OXFORD — PRELIMINARY MEETING OF BISHOPS FOR PAN-ANGLICAN SYNOD — MEETING OF COLONIAL BISHOPS — SPECIAL SERVICES AT S. LAWRENCE, JEWRY — MEETING OF ENGLISH AND AFRICAN BISHOPS — DECLARATION CONSIDERED AND ACCEPTED — PAN-ANGLICAN SYNOD — IMPROMPTU DECLARATION OF FIFTY-FIVE BISHOPS ACCEPTING THE SENTENCE ON DR. COLENSO — RESOLUTIONS AND PASTORAL LETTER — CONVERSAZIONE IN S. JAMES'S HALL — CONCLUDING SERVICE — THE "TIMES" — CHURCH CONGRESS AT WOLVERHAMPTON — PRESENTATION OF CROZIER — ELY — MR. BUTLER AS BISHOP-ELECT — CORRESPONDENCE — MR. BUTLER DECIDES NOT TO GO TO NATAL — MEETINGS AT S. P. G., S. ANDREW'S WELLS STREET — CAMBRIDGE — RESUMED LAMBETH CONFERENCE — REPORT OF NATAL COMMITTEE — SEARCH FOR A BISHOP OF NATAL — MR. MACRORIE — OXFORD — DIFFICULTIES ABOUT CONSECRATION — LETTER FROM THE BISHOP OF LONDON: FROM THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK — REPLIES — CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY — CONVOCATION: LOWER HOUSE, UPPER HOUSE — CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE BISHOP OF OXFORD — VISIT TO OXFORD — ROUND IN THE NORTH — YORK — NORWICH — DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM'S DESPATCH — INTERVIEWS — SIR ROUNDELL PALMER — DESPATCH WITHDRAWN — JOURNEYS — CUDDESDEN FESTIVAL — REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONVOCATION — DEBATE OF THE UPPER HOUSE: LOWER HOUSE — NATAL QUESTION IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS — E. C. U. — MEETING AT S. P. G. FOR CAPE TOWN ASSOCIATION — QUESTION OF MANDATE — VEXATIOUS DELAYS — APPOINTMENT OF DEAN OF CAPE TOWN TO BE BISHOP OF BOMBAY — PREPARATIONS TO DEPART — FAREWELL SERVICES AT S. LAWRENCE, JEWRY — INTERVIEW WITH MR. DISRAELI — LAST WORDS FROM PLYMOUTH TO BISHOP OF OXFORD.

AFTER a prosperous voyage, touching at S. Helena, where there was time for an interview with Bishop Welby, and also at Madeira, the Bishop and Mrs. Gray landed at Southampton, July 23rd, 1867, and went at once to London, where almost his first object was to see the Bishop of Oxford, his unfailing adviser and sympathiser through all his troubles, and whose hearty and unconventional embrace seemed to carry real comfort with it. Bishop Wilberforce was not well, and his friend

found him in bed, but the day's programme scarcely sounds restorative:—Breakfast at 9, with a Ritual discussion; Ecclesiastical Commission Meeting at 11; at 1 o'clock a Ritual Commission Meeting, where the Bishop expected trouble; and at 5 House of Lords, where Lord Shaftesbury's Ritual Bill was to come on; etc. etc.

Bishop Gray plunged at once into work, and his Journal records a series of discussions at S. P. G. with Mr. Bullock, at the Colonial Office with Sir F. Rogers and Sir G. Barrow; conferences with prelates English and American; and the like. One of these gentlemen, now Lord Blachford, refers in a private letter to his share in these interviews, saying: "I, as every one else must have been who came across the Bishop of Cape Town, was greatly struck by the energy, ability, courage, and singlemindedness with which he pursued the objects to which he had devoted himself; and I used to hear of the acts of generosity, and of the love and respect which he inspired. Our communications, though very interesting at the time, were on matters of business of passing importance, sometimes of controversy (political), so that they left behind them nothing to *tell*, but only the impression which all who met him must have derived from his manner, appearance, and history."

Amid his manifold engagements, one most religiously heeded was attendance upon Judge Watermeyer, who had come home in consequence of ill health, and who was now dying. Bishop Gray had given him introductions to the Bishop of Oxford, etc., with a view to his spiritual comfort, and he now used to visit him himself, praying with him and comforting him, and giving him the Blessed Sacrament. The Judge died September 21st, and the Bishop attended his burial.

The warmest sympathy was shown to the African Metropolitan by many of his Episcopal brethren. Affection and sympathy always cheered him, though, as he said, "praise was almost as painful as abuse;" especially feeling as he did that no other course was open to him than that which he had followed. From Archbishop Longley he always met with almost tender kindness. Bishop Gray visited him at Addington shortly after his arrival in England, and they went over the subjects to be

discussed at the coming Conference, as also the troubles of the African Church. At this time it was a question whether Mr. Butler should not be consecrated immediately, so as to take his place in the coming assembly of Bishops. Bishop Gray was frequently at the House, listening to the debates on the Colonial Church Bill, etc. In August he went to Pershore with his sister, Mrs. Williamson, to Mr. Douglas at Hanbury, and to Mr. Murray of Bromsgrove, where he was pleading the cause of his Diocese when summoned in haste by the Archbishop to discuss Mr. Butler's consecration. Hurrying up to London, Bishop Gray was seized with one of his old attacks, and he was so ill that he could hardly get through the consultation, which he sums up by saying: "The Archbishop and Bishop of Oxford told me that they had agreed that the best course was for me to address the Archbishop, and for him to consult his Suffragans. As this was announced to me as conclusive, I felt that I could not vigorously contest it; and indeed the lateness of the hour, and my pain and exhaustion, prevented my saying all that I otherwise would have said. I was, however, greatly disappointed. I fear that the intention is to shelve the whole question; and then what becomes of the Church of England and of her witness for Christ in South Africa?" The result of this interview was the following letter:—

To the Bishop of Oxford.

"4 Linden Grove, August 10th, 1867.

"My dear Bishop—I have sent to the Archbishop the formal letter which I undertook at his request to write. It is with great misgivings and anxiety that I contemplate the course about to be pursued. Had the question of the sending forth a Bishop been submitted to the gathering of Bishops, after invocation of the Holy Ghost, I should have been perfectly satisfied. To submit it privately in succession to the Bishops of the Province, seems to me likely to have but one issue. If you and the Archbishop hesitate, how can they be expected to do otherwise? Then what is to be done? Under such discouragements, and without the knowledge of men who might be willing to go out, even though the countenance of the

English Bishops were withheld, I do not think that another Bishop could be elected. Then Colenso would remain with the acquiescence of the English Church teaching his dreadful heresies in her name and with (in some sense) her authority. In a very few years the Church in Natal would die out. It is not in human nature for men to struggle on for ever, under the trials and difficulties which beset them, deserted as they would feel themselves to be. But what would be the position of the Bishops and others in the remaining South African Dioceses? I am sure that there are very many both here and in South Africa who would feel greatly troubled as to what duty demanded of them if Colenso's claims are acquiesced in. The refusal of Convocation to say that it was not in communion with Dr. Colenso has, to my knowledge, been a great trouble to many consciences. The declining to sanction the election made of a successor to him will be a greater. There may be difficulties attending upon the consecration which I cannot see; but I am sure that if all allusion to Natal is to be forbidden in our Conference, when half the Church believes that it will form the chief subject for consideration,—and if the Church's sanction is to be withheld from Butler's consecration, that very great evil will result. Circumstanced as I am, I feel that I ought not to withhold my convictions at this juncture. I have not the least wish to bias your mind from any personal considerations; but if consequences arose which I myself cannot help dreading, I should blame myself greatly hereafter if I had been silent now. I am sure that you will forgive me for pouring out my anxieties to you. I was hardly able, from suffering and exhaustion, to say much in the House, and I have been in my bed ever since. Had there been time, and I were well, I do not think it would have been respectful to the Archbishop to argue against what he termed his conclusion in the matter.—Believe me ever, etc. R. Capetown."

While still ailing, the Bishop went to his son at Kidderminster, where he preached; and then to Wantage, which admirably-worked parish, with its machinery of Home, Schools of all kinds, etc., excited more than ever his wish to see its

organiser at the helm of the troubled ship he had left behind him. Sermons and meetings, as of old, began to fill up every day, and the Bishop's Journal records his movements in all directions. He always left the arrangements for these to his wife, who used to make him out the neatest possible plan or programme of what he had to do,—trains marked, hours of engagements noted. These he used to call his "lessons;" and if, as occasionally did happen, he lost his precious "lesson," he was altogether thrown out and did not know where or how he was to go." [1]

[1] As a specimen of these Lessons :—

Sunday, October 26th.

Morning Service. St. Matthew's, City Road.

Mr. Laurell to have a cab and sandwiches ready by 1.10. 35 minutes to London Bridge.

London Bridge, 1.45.

Sevenoaks Junction, 2.53. Brougham to meet this. One mile to drive.

If too late for this train, try for

London Bridge, 2.0.

Dartford, 2.55. Fly, seven miles, to

Afternoon Service. Crocken Hill. Rev. W. Gardner.

Service ¼ to 4. Fly to be ready.

Drive by Dartford to Mrs. George Murray's, The Hollies (?), Hirn's Cross Stone, for refreshments. Then on to

Evening Service. Greenhithe. Rev. — Russell.

Service at 7.

Sleep at Mrs. G. Murray's (or Rev. F. W. Murray). ¼ of hour walk.

Monday, October 27th.

Gravesend. Evening Meeting, 7 p.m.

Greenhithe .	2.1	3.8	4.29	Dine and sleep at
Gravesend .	2.13	3.20	4.38	Rev. C. E. Robinson's.

Tuesday, October 28th.

Leytonstone. Evening Meeting, 7 p.m. Rev. H. H. Evans.

Gravesend, Town Pier . . .	11.27
Tilbury	11.40
Plaistow	12.26

Mr. Cotton's carriage to meet you, and take you to his house to dinner after 2. (Church Union Meeting 5½.) Service, Forest School before Meeting. Rev. J. S. Gilderdale.

Late trains :

Leytonstone .	8.43	10.21	Plaistow . .	9.48
Fenchurch Street	9.13		Fenchurch Street .	10.10
Bishopsgate Street		10.45		

Late in August the Bishop returned to London, to meet his South African brethren, and prepare with them the matters to be brought before the Synod. They agreed fully and heartily upon certain Resolutions, which were to be submitted to the other Colonial Bishops who were to meet at Archdeacon Wordsworth's on September 19th and 20th. The Archbishop and Bishop of Oxford proposed that Bishop Gray should invite the English Bishops to meet the African Prelates before the Conference, in order to discuss Mr. Butler's appointment. He however said that it was useless for him to do this on such short notice (it was then already September 4th), and that the Archbishop alone could now get them together. His reply was conveyed in the following earnest letter to Bishop Wilberforce :—

"September 4th, 1867.

"My dear Bishop . . . Several of the Colonial Bishops have had, as the Archbishop suggested, meetings to consider the Resolutions named in the printed paper as likely to be brought under the notice of the Conference, and at their request I have asked all the Colonial Bishops now in England to meet on the 19th and 20th at Archdeacon Wordsworth's, who has offered his house for the purpose. I do not think that I could, with any hope of success, invite the English Bishops to a meeting. Some of them at least would feel that I was taking a liberty with them, and very few would or could perhaps attend at a short notice, and at my request. The only possible chance, as it appears to me, of getting them together, would be for the Archbishop himself to summon them. But I confess that, besides this, I think that the South African Bishops have done all that they can or ought to do in this matter, and that the responsibility as to the future now rests wholly with the English Bishops. We have done all that we can in the way of consulting the Mother Church, and have endeavoured to carry out the course laid down, whether in the Resolutions of Convocation in 1866, or in his Grace's and your joint letter to Mr. Butler, in its minutest points. The second election has taken place as directed; the declaration has been made, and is

ready to be submitted to his Grace, if he desires to see it; and we have, as Convocation suggested, presented Mr. Butler to the Archbishop for consecration. We can, I think, do no more. I had hoped that Mr. Butler might have been consecrated before the Conference, taken his seat at it, and gone forth with all the moral weight which would have attached to a general recognition of him on the part of the whole English Episcopate. It is too late probably now for that, but it is not too late for him to be summoned as Bishop-elect; and I earnestly implore of you, for the sake of all concerned, but chiefly for the sake of the Church of England herself, to urge the Archbishop to summon him.

"This is not, my dear Bishop, a time for men to conceal what is passing in their own minds, and I will open my whole soul to you, whom I have loved deeply and reverenced deeply, and from whom it would be a great pain to be separated. But, after long and anxious thought, I am driven to this conclusion, That if the English Bishops do not separate themselves from Colenso, whose writings they have in Synod declared are subversive of the Faith, and will not give the right hand of fellowship to him who has been elected in accordance with the principles they have laid down, but ignore the act of deposition and separation from the communion of the Church on the part of those who alone have authority from Christ and from the Canons of the Church to separate their brother,—they involve the Church of which they are Bishops in formal heresy, and—forgive me for speaking what I feel—are unfaithful to Christ and betray His cause. God forgive me and teach me otherwise if I am wrong. I shall be the greatest sufferer if I be in error; but, believing this, I do not see what other course is open to us, if that came to pass which appears too probable, but for me to resign my present position, and with it communion with the Church of England.

"I need not tell you how infinite to me would be the pain of this step. From infancy I was taught to love the Church of England. I have loved her very dearly, and, however imperfectly, have served her faithfully, with all my power. I

still believe her to have (apart from her thraldom to the State) the best inheritance and the truest position in Christendom, and that round her might yet be gathered all that is good and true. All that I care for on earth is still wrapped up in her, and it would be a sore trial to me to separate from the many whom I honour, admire, revere. But if Dr. Colenso is not publicly disowned and repudiated by her Bishops, if his excommunication is not recognised by them, and another welcomed in his room, I shall feel constrained to sacrifice all. I need not tell you that I could never go to Rome; I believe the supremacy, as now held, a lie; the worship offered to the Blessed Virgin, idolatrous. Nor need I add that I feel keenly the position in which I should place myself. I see all this, and, sad as it would be, it would be less intolerable than even an implicit alliance with or recognition of known heresy. My own belief is that even you do not know how deeply thousands of the best men in England feel upon this subject. I am spoken to or written to every day upon the subject. The only courses, I believe open are, either to summon Butler as Bishop-elect, or to recognise, by public act, the deposition and excommunication. Both ought to be done; what the hindrance is to the recognition of Butler, I cannot understand. The legal difficulties appear to me mere cobwebs; but if the Bishops are not prepared to make a stand in this case, they never can or will make a stand against the world, but if the State bids them, must recognise Jews and Mahometans. I hear, not from himself, but from an undoubted authority, that the Bishop of Gibraltar has said he will not attend the Conference, because he hears that the Colenso question is to be excluded.—Believe me ever, my dear Bishop, affectionately yours, R. CAPETOWN."

Meanwhile the Bishop records a visit to S. Michael's, Shoreditch, wishing, as he says, to help an earnest man working in one of the most trying London districts. "I found Mr. Nihill living in two small rooms at the top of a model lodging-house. On the ground was the Sisterhood in four or five small rooms; the Superior was a former parishioner of mine at Stockton,

once a Wesleyan. I found them living in the utmost simplicity and poverty, with beds, furniture, rooms, not better than those of the poor; their only luxury a quiet little oratory. One Sister has charge of the school just begun with one hundred children; another of a little shop for the sale of Bibles, Prayer Books, etc. All visit the poor, and care for them in sickness. The church was full with a congregation of people, chiefly, I think, men from the lower orders, and lower middle. After the 3rd Collect, Mr. Nihill came up to me and said that full 250 people had come from a neighbouring congregation to express their gratitude to Almighty God for the defence of the Faith on the part of the Church of South Africa,—that it was very late, near ten o'clock,—and they could not remain for the sermon—would I give the blessing before the sermon? I agreed to this, and before preaching said a few words on the subject to the congregation."[1]

September 1st, the Bishop went to S. Alban's, Holborn, where he liked the hearty responses of warm devotion; though, coming, as he now did, for the first time to what are called Ritualistic services, and being, as he has said already for himself, not constitutionally fond of ritual, he did not understand or enter into all he saw; though, judging by parallel entries of "Drowsy service at . . ." there is not much room left to doubt which his hearty spirit of devotion would prefer And when in 1869 he was called to give his official opinion upon "Ritualistic" proceedings, as used in South Africa, he will be found giving a clear emphatic judgment which stopped the mouths of cavillers. Nevertheless the Bishop was most assuredly not a Ritualist, as the word has been used, though thoroughly Catholic he as assuredly was, and his large-hearted sympathy went out towards all whom he found doing good service for God. At Wymering he "visited the Home where many Sisters are employed in various works, including an orphanage. Much pleased. I found there one preparing to be a Sister, who told me that she used to come

[1] The Bishop was vexed afterwards at some of the newspapers taking this up, as though he had intentionally thrown himself into a prominent Ritualistic demonstration, which was not the case.

to me as a young girl at Stockton for religious guidance." He also went over the "kind of college," and was pleased with it and its practical teaching, especially with one "huge Yorkshireman," whom he found cooking.

In a letter to Bishop Welby, written about this time, Bishop Gray says: "Ritualists may be indiscreet in some things; but all England is going in for a higher form of worship; Dissenters not less than Churchmen. And men who are called Ritualists (it is impossible to draw the line) have a firmer grasp of the Faith than most others. Moderate Ritualism is decidedly popular already, and my belief is that gradually the Church will adopt almost all that these men are contending for."

In their tour of visits Hursley was included, where of those loved friends the Kebles, the graves only were to be found; and after a gathering at Beaminster, where some old friends gathered round him, the Bishop reached Salisbury on September 11th.

"Soon after arriving the Bishops of Oxford and Salisbury proposed to me to walk with them. We walked till near seven o'clock discussing the question whether anything was to be done about Colenso in the Episcopal Conference. I have never had a more painful discussion.[1] Their argument is that nothing can be done—I. Because the Archbishop pledged himself that nothing should be done; II. Because the Bishops cannot agree, and division would be scandalous. I, on the other hand, maintain that the Angels of the Churches assembled in the Name of Christ, after invocation of the Holy Ghost, cannot pass over the fearful scandal which the Colenso heresies have occasioned, without sinning against our wounded and insulted Lord;—that something *must* be done;—that the Churches must declare that they hold no communion with Colenso, and will give the right hand of fellowship to Butler, or if they like not him, to some other faithful man elected in his room, and confirmed by the Bishops of the Province. They reply that the Bishops would then have

[1] Referring to this season Bishop Gray said to a friend: "They accuse me of self-seeking and love of power; but I should not care if I were at the bottom of the sea, so long as the English Church does her duty!"

as a body to accept the deposition and excommunication, and that some of them object to this. I rejoin that I do not want the Bishops to endorse anything that I have said or done; that if the Church re-echoes the Bishops of London and S. David's' denunciations, I will be silent and acquiesce, but that, if I had said nothing, still the Church in her Synod of Canterbury had pronounced Colenso's teaching subversive of the Faith, and would be bound to hold no communion with him; that if nothing is done, the allegiance of thousands of the Church of England will be shaken; and that I must ask the Church to do that which, if she will not do, she would go far to destroy her character as a witness for Christ.

"They then appeal to me to cover and not expose the shame and weakness of my Mother Church; and as Butler cannot be recognised, to pass him over; choose some one else at the Cape, consecrate him there, and let him come home and preach in their churches; or else that I should find some one here who might be willing to go out without that sanction of the home Church which Butler considers essential. I point out that I cannot set aside the election of the Clergy and Laity of Natal; that three years ago they decided that they would never elect any one who had taken part against Colenso, lest it should be said that they had personal objects to serve in their opposition to him; that if it were known that the House of Bishops refused to hold out the hand of fellowship to Butler, no one else could be expected to go. I am afraid that my dear brethren regard me as obstinate, self-willed, determined at all hazards to force the Mother Church to a recognition of my proceedings, or else to incur risk of a schism. They will hardly believe that it is to save the Church of England herself from a course which I believe to be suicidal, that I make the stand which I feel constrained to do."

The next morning the annual Sarum Festival of S. P. G. was kept, the Dean of Cork (Dr. Magee) preaching "a wonderful sermon; then luncheon-dinner [at the palace]. I think there must have been two hundred people; and a meeting at 6.30 in the Town Hall. I was so disturbed and distressed in mind

that I wished not to attend, as if I spoke I must say what would probably be distasteful to my dear friends. The Bishop of Oxford, however, said, that if I did not name the Conference they did not care what I said. The meeting was evidently intended as a great demonstration in support of the Bishop of Salisbury, at this time of great trial to him (seventy of his Clergy having appealed to the Archbishop against him in consequence of his Charge). I was received with great enthusiasm, which upset me, and in my present worn and weak state from want of sleep (I was thinking and praying for guidance half the night) broke me down for the moment. I, however, said what I wanted to do, though with a sadness and oppression of spirit which rather changed the previously jubilant tone of the meeting.[1] A large party to supper again in the evening."

The next day, September 13th, the Bishop was called out of the Cathedral for another talk with the Bishops, the Bishop of Oxford being obliged to leave before service was over. "Their tone was modified since our last conversation. The Bishop of Salisbury proposed to move a resolution. S. Oxon dwelt more upon legal proceedings. God guide us all aright! He gave me a letter from the Archbishop, written in consequence of my solemn one to him. The dear Archbishop much distressed, but argued the case for doing nothing. Wrote another long letter to his Grace, explaining matters, replying to his statements."[2] The next day, September 14th, Bishop Gray joined the Glovers at Shaftesbury, greatly exhausted and worn in body and mind. How keenly he felt the present state of things may be seen from the entry in his Journal of September 15th:—

"I have felt keenly to-day how nearly I stand alone, as far

[1] A friend who was present at this meeting wrote: "When Bishop Gray rose to speak, there was such an expression of deep sorrow on his face, and he spoke evidently with such painful effort, that one feared he would break down; but the intense earnestness of his manner so enchained his hearers, that even the eloquence of the Bishop of Winchester seemed to fall flat by comparison. The deep sorrowful earnestness of his manner struck every one."

[2] He wrote that same day, telling his son some of his troubles, concluding with these words: "Do not, even in your heart, find fault with the Bishops, but pray that our gathering may be overruled for good, and the clouds which hang around your father's head be dispersed."

as the Episcopate is concerned. Not an English Bishop is, I fear, prepared to support me on the points of refusing communion to Colenso, and giving the right hand of fellowship to Butler. My daily prayer for myself these many years has been, Give me the gifts and graces needful for my high office,—wisdom, faithfulness, patience, meekness, humility, gentleness, purity, love, firmness, decision, determination. Never did I need them all so much as now. Would that I had prayed more fervently and striven more earnestly to become what I have prayed that I might be. Of Clergy and Laity I have no doubt that multitudes are with me. I am told so on all sides, nor can I for a moment doubt that mine is the right and only safe course for the Church to pursue."

On September 17th a meeting of about thirty-six Bishops took place at S. P. G., with the object of preparation for the coming Conference. The following account of it is taken from the Bishop of Cape Town's notes. The Archbishop consulted them about various matters of detail, such as the admission of reporters, whether the Bishops were to be robed, what the services should be. The opening service, it was settled, should be in Lambeth Chapel, the concluding one possibly in Westminster Abbey; but it was already understood that the Dean only offered this on the condition that Dr. Colenso was not condemned, and the Bishop of Cape Town not supported. The Archbishop read a letter from the Bishop of Brechin objecting to the title "*Protestant* Episcopal" as applied to the Scotch Church, and a discussion followed in which the Americans joined.[1] "The Bishop of Oxford proposed a form which should be general, and include all Churches in communion with the Church of England. I had prepared a similar form. The Bishop of Norwich proposed we should come to no decision at this meeting, as it would hamper decisions at the Conference. This was agreed to. I then stated my objection to the clause which had been added in the second edition of printed resolutions, as presumptuous, aggressive, inexact, unwise. It assumed

[1] We remember to have heard certain eminent Americans express their profound objection to the name during that same autumn.

that we were on the mount, and had to teach all others. . . It was *aggressive;* we were 'to seek to diffuse through every part of the Christian community the principles of the English Reformation!' Unity would not be reached through controversy. It was *inexact,* because we did not want Rome or Greece to 'return' to the 'faith of the undivided Church;' but to rid themselves of what they had added to that faith. *Unbecoming,* because we were more lax than other religious bodies as to insisting that the Faith should be taught in our churches. We could hardly press others to a 'resolution' to abide by *discipline* when we had no such resolution ourselves; when we allowed adulterers to come unreproved to Holy Communion, and scarce professed to have any discipline except for Clergy. . . . The Bishop of Montreal then read a letter from the Bishop of Columbia, expressing his great regret that he could not fulfil his intention of attending the Synod, and appointing Montreal his proxy. He was anxious on two points:—1, Support of the Bishop of Cape Town's proceedings *in re* Colenso. 2, Protest against legislation for Colonial Church. He had written to me on the subject. I next told the Archbishop that the Bishop of St. Helena had requested me to act for him."

The Bishop of Graham's Town (Cotterill) then spoke of subjects his Diocesan Synod wished him to lay before the Conference, and alluded to Resolutions which we desired to submit as bearing on those published by the Archbishop.

The Bishop of Ontario (Lewis) then rose and asked if he should be allowed then or at the Conference to submit some Resolution on the subject of Natal? The Canadian Church had asked for this Synod mainly with a view to the settlement of this question, and great injury, in his belief, would be done if it were passed over.

The Bishop of Gibraltar (Trower) had a Resolution which he would ask leave to read. It related to Natal; expressed sympathy with the Bishop of Cape Town, and claimed from Government remedy for the evil inflicted on the Colonial Church through mistakes about letters patent, etc.

The Bishop of Huron (Cronyn) felt that the greatest evil and

greatest disappointment would arise if the Conference did not come to some decision on the Colenso question.

The Bishop of London (Tait) saw the greatest difficulty in taking it up. The Bishops had come to this Conference, never dreaming that it would be entertained. It was unfair to them to force it on. Unestablished bodies could not understand the peculiar difficulties of an Established Church.

The Bishop of Cape Town spoke of the necessity laid upon him—he must speak his mind fully and freely, and would, beforehand, apologise if he said one word to wound. Conference, he thought, could not ignore this subject. It was the first time that the Churches had met since this great scandal had arisen. The heresies which had been taught by one still claiming to be a Bishop of the Church of England, and to speak in her name with authority, were greater than any that had been put forth by any Bishop of the Church. The Church of England, when it considered the subject in Convocation, had spoken with hesitation; the trumpet had given an uncertain sound; this had been Dr. Colenso's great moral support. He had said, and his followers had said, that men could not be wrong in holding communion with him, seeing that the English Bishops did not disown him. He had appealed to the position of the Bishop of London, to the learning of S. David's (Thirlwall), to the undoubted orthodoxy of Lincoln (Jackson) and Ely (H. Browne). Words of the Bishop of Lincoln had been expressly quoted in public documents as justifying Colenso's position. The speaker felt that if the Church now met was desirous to remain a branch of the Church of Christ, it must repudiate him who had taught these fearful heresies.

I. Duty to Christ, her injured and insulted Lord, required it, for He had been pronounced ignorant and in error,—not to know more than any intellectual Jew of His own day; it was said that He ought not to be adored.

II. Duty to herself. Her own position as a branch of the Church of Christ was at stake. She had herself declared Colenso to be a heretic, and she could not hold communion with him, without sharing his heresy. It was necessary to vindicate her

in the sight of Christendom that she should disown him. All the world was expecting it, nearly all the Bishops who had come to the Synod expected it. If it was a wrong done to the English Bishops to discuss a question which they had decided not to discuss, it was a much greater wrong to those who had come from the farthest ends of the earth, expecting it to form a chief subject of discussion, if it was set aside. Men's minds were troubled, uneasy. Allegiance to the Church was shaken. It would be an evil day for the Church of England and for us all, if nothing were done.

III. Duty to those souls who, because of the Church's hesitation, were clinging on to heresy.

IV. Duty to the struggling Church of Natal, which would soon be destroyed if nothing were done.

The Conference could do this (the Bishop of Cape Town said) without endorsing his proceedings if they disapproved of them. In truth he loathed the very expression "sympathy with the Bishop of Cape Town," which was so often used. They might utterly condemn his course, if only they would steer clear of all complicity with this heresy. They might repudiate Dr. Colenso not because the Bishop had deposed him, but because their own Synod had condemned him. He could never understand the legal difficulties which some English Bishops foresaw; the only difficulty which could arise would be if any statesman forced Dr. Colenso upon the Church as a Bishop, or any patron presented him to a living. Would any Dean or Chapter dare to elect? any Bishop who knew that he must stand before Christ's Judgment-seat, dare to give him spiritual mission—cure of souls? Then would not such a decision as he was asking for be a great support to any called to bear this trial? The only penalty that he knew of for those who held that the law of God was higher than the law of man would be an action at law, the penalty of *præmunire*. The dear Dean of Maritzburg and other faithful Clergy were braving this; even now they were probably turned out of their Churches and homes. Why could not an English Bishop do the same? He implored them not to pass by this great question.

The Bishop of Lincoln said he had not changed his view as to law. The law might say that Colenso was in legal communion (!) with the Church, and then what was to be done?

The Bishop of Cape Town asked if his brother would institute Dr. Colenso to the cure of souls?

The Bishop of Lincoln would not do so.

The Bishop of New York (Potter) said that it was quite true that two-thirds if not three-fourths of American Churchmen wished to see the matter settled here, and alluded to the uncomfortable position in which the American Bishops found themselves when opposing their kind and hospitable English brethren.

The Bishop of Montreal (Fulford) said it was a question affecting the whole Church, and infinite disappointment and mischief would be caused if nothing were done.

The Bishop of New Zealand (Selwyn) wished to explain why his Church had not done more in publicly avowing Colenso's deposition, because it had no doubt, but was thoroughly one with the Bishop of Cape Town. He accepted the sentence as that of the proper tribunal.

The Bishop of London dwelt strongly on legal difficulties. He had approved of all the Bishop of Cape Town had done up to excommunication, but he thought when the sentence was declared null and void in law, the case ought to have begun through the legal courts *de novo*. He wished the Bishop of Cape Town, instead of raising the question here, would meet the Bishops in Conference, they point out fully their legal difficulties, and counsel him or the Archbishop how to proceed. The real difficulty was, How was he a Metropolitan? made by letters patent which were now worth nothing.

The Bishop of Oxford drew out the distinction between the legal act of a legal court and the spiritual decision of a spiritual court which had no existence in law. The Privy Council had said that the Metropolitan's act was one of which law could take no cognisance, but that did not touch his spiritual act. He further answered the Bishop of London as to the whole history of the Metropolitical office. He thought that the object of the Bishop of Cape Town might be attained by an

addition to, or amendment of, some of the resolutions, and, with his Grace's permission, he would propose an amendment.

The Bishop of Cape Town said he would be very glad to meet and discuss with the English Bishops the question of future legal proceedings against Dr. Colenso, the prosecution of appeal which must come on in November, and the case of the four Natal Clergy. Some more conversation on that and other subjects took place, and the meeting broke up.

The next day (September 18th) Bishop Gray had a good deal of conversation with some of the American Bishops—Vermont, Arkansas, North Carolina, etc.—who were most hearty, almost enthusiastic, in their encouragement to him. On the 19th the proposed meeting of Colonial Bishops took place at Archdeacon Wordsworth's. Bishop Gray walked down there, feeling, as he said, refreshed and invigorated by the air, and by the quiet time for thought and prayer as he went. At the meeting were assembled the Bishops of New Zealand, Montreal, Barbados, Christ Church, Gibraltar, Huron, Ontario, Niagara, Graham's Town, Nova Scotia, Central Africa, Free State, Labuan, and Quebec. The resolutions agreed to by the South African Bishops formed the basis for discussion. Most of the points were agreed to; some resolutions were improved, others (so Bishop Gray thought) "emasculated, with a view to carry what we could. I was obliged to leave at 5, for Croydon, where I had to preach—a beautiful choral harvest service—crowded church. Got home again after 11 P.M., much exhausted." He had a suffering, sleepless night, the usual penalty of excitement and anxiety, and returned to the meeting (adjourned) feeling worn and ill. The Bishop records that they had a "very interesting discussion, and decidedly improved some of our resolutions; again, weakened others. I read to the Bishops the resolutions which I meant to propose, pledging the Conference to recognise Butler and hold no communion with Colenso. All said that the English Bishops would not concur. I said that I must move them. Too ill to discuss the subject fully. The Bishop of Gibraltar proposed a most weak but perfectly harmless resolution, which all adopted,

for not one stood fully by me. 'The Bishops think it right to declare their conviction that the character of the whole Anglican Communion is affected by the present condition of Natal, and they recommend the appointment of a Committee to consider the best means by which the Church may be delivered from the scandal;' very inoffensive, but, for all that appears on the surface, Bishop Cotterill's or my own proceedings may be the cause of the scandal, not Bishop Colenso's heresies."

After the meeting broke up, at 5.30 P.M., the Bishop went with some friends to one of the Missionary Services which were proving so successful at S. Lawrence's, Jewry, the church being crowded three times a day. "I felt quite exhausted, head splitting, spirit broken. Church crammed from end to end —service very noble—volume of voice overpowering—enough for the greatest cathedral. There were five Bishops and more than a hundred Clergy present—congregation a sea of heads; got through my sermon, my power of voice increasing as I proceeded—got home between 11 and 12, beat. I have not for a long time been so near breaking down. The church was suffocating."

Harassing days, sermons in crowded churches, and sleepless nights, were, as the Bishop wrote in his Journal on the 23rd, "a poor preparation for a very trying day;" adding, with an expression of anguish which he did not often suffer to escape him, "O my God, I cry unto Thee in the night season, and Thou hearest not!" But in truth God heard him, and it was only his deep inward sense of God's upholding Hand, and of His imperative claims, which enabled Bishop Gray to bear up resolutely and patiently through this well-nigh overwhelming season. This day, the 23rd, the Colonial Bishops again met, at Archdeacon Wordsworth's, to work up matter for the Synods, put the resolutions agreed upon into shape, etc. "Sir Frederick Rogers came, and we discussed legal questions relating to the Colonial Church with him. I was obliged to leave without concluding matters, and at 2 P.M. attended at S. P. G., to meet English Bishops with African, and two other Metropolitans, New Zealand and Montreal, to discuss the Colenso

question. 1, Considered whether legal proceedings could or ought to be taken to deprive him of letters patent—general feeling that none should be taken. Next, whether I should proceed with appeal *in re* property—feeling against it. Then, the course to be pursued. All at length agreed that the Bishops of Montreal and New Zealand should submit the following Resolution on the second day of the Conference,—the Bishop of London reserving right to suggest alterations if he found that those with whom he acted differed:—

Resolved—"That in the judgment of the Bishops now assembled the whole Anglican Communion is deeply injured by the present condition of the Church in Natal, and that a Committee be appointed at this general meeting to consider the whole case, and inquire into all the proceedings which have been taken therein, and to report on the best mode by which the Church may be delivered from the continuance of the scandal, and the true Faith maintained; and that such report be forwarded to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, with a request that, if possible, it may be communicated to any adjourned meeting of this Conference; and further, that his Grace be requested to transmit the same to all Bishops of the Anglican Communion, and to ask for their judgment thereupon."

"The Bishop of New Zealand was very strong upon the point that the Conference could not, as a Synod of the whole Church, confirm either the decision of the Province of Canterbury, or that of Cape Town, without going into the whole question. I contended that the Conference must either accept the spiritual sentence, or provide for a rehearing of the case—and that I should push matters to this. The Resolution as agreed upon I assented to as providing for a full judgment of the Church diffusive. We then discussed the question of Butler's consecration. The Bishop of Oxford put the question to the Metropolitan of Montreal and New Zealand, Whether the proceedings in the election, as stated by me, were canonical? They thought they were. The Bishop of Oxford undertook to see whether the Archbishop would consent, upon this state-

ment, to recommend Mr. Butler to go. I read the Resolution on the subject which I intended to propose to Conference, unless the matter were previously settled, or his Grace thought it unwise to raise the question in Conference."

On the 24th the Pan-Anglican Synod met at Lambeth, about eighty Bishops being present. The day began with celebration[1] in the chapel, and a sermon from the Bishop of Illinois. The session was opened by an address from the Archbishop.

In this address (which was published by authority) his Grace recapitulated the subjects of discussion already named in the prospectus sent to all the Bishops.

I. The best way of promoting the reunion of Christendom.
II. The notification of the establishment of new Sees.
III. Letters commendatory for Clergymen and laymen passing to distant Dioceses.
IV. Subordination in our Colonial Church to Metropolitans.
V. Discipline to be exercised by Metropolitans.
VI. Court of the Metropolitans.
VII. Question of Appeal.
VIII. Conditions of union with the Church at home.
IX. Notification of proposed Missionary Bishops.
X. Subordination of Missionaries.

The Archbishop observed that in the selection of topics regard had been chiefly borne to those which bear on practical difficulties seeming to require solution. It had been found impossible to meet all views and embrace every recommendation, and it had been thought desirable on this occasion rather to do too little than to attempt too much, and confine discussion to matters admitting of a practical and beneficial solution. "The unexpected position in which our Colonial Churches have recently found themselves placed," his Grace said, "has

[1] It was stated in the *Guardian* of September 25, 1867, that on this occasion the bread used was made from corn grown at Bethlehem, and the wine brought from Jerusalem.

naturally created a great feeling of uneasiness in the minds of many. I am fully persuaded that the idea of any essential separation from the Mother Church is universally repudiated by them;—they all cling to her with the strongest filial affection, while they are bound to her doctrines and forms of worship by cogent motives of interest. At the same time, I have good reason to believe that there are various shades of opinion as to the best mode in which the connection between the Daughter Churches and their common Mother can best be maintained; and I trust that the interchange of thought between those who are chiefly interested in those important questions will lead to some profitable conclusions." After some other remarks, the Archbishop went on to say, "Doubtless there is much in these latter days, even as we have all been taught to expect, which is dark and dispiriting to the mind that has not been exercised to discern the meaning of such signs. The enemy is on every side plying his insidious arts to sap the foundations of belief, to hinder the cause of God's Church, and prevent the Word of God from doing its work in the conversion of the soul of sinful man. No effort is spared to disparage the authority of those who witness for the truth, and uphold the dogmatic teaching for which the teaching of the Apostolic writings is at once the model and the warrant. Though it be not our purpose to enter upon theological discussion, yet our very presence here is a witness to our resolution to maintain the Faith which we hold in common as our priceless heritage set forth in our Liturgy and other formularies; and this our united celebration of offices common to our respective Churches in each quarter of the globe is a claim in the face of the world for the independence of separate Churches, as well as a protest against the assumption, by any Bishop of the Church Catholic, of dominion over his fellows in the Episcopate." After some words of sorrow over the divided state of Christendom, and invocation of the Spirit of Wisdom, Peace, and Love, the Archbishop concluded, and the Declaration was considered. Its form, as finally accepted, was—

"We, Bishops of Christ's Holy Catholic Church, in visible

communion with the United Church of England and Ireland, professing the Faith delivered to us in Holy Scripture, maintained by the Fathers of the English Reformation, now assembled by the good Providence of God at the Archiepiscopal Palace of Lambeth, under the presidency of the Primate of all England, desire—I. To give hearty thanks to Almighty God for having thus brought us together for common counsels and united worship; II. We desire to express the deep sorrow with which we view the divided condition of the flock of Christ throughout the world, ardently longing for the fulfilment of the prayer of our Lord, 'That all may be one,' etc.; and, III. We do here solemnly record our conviction that unity will be most effectually promoted by maintaining the Faith in its purity and integrity as taught in the Holy Scriptures, held in the Primitive Church, summed up in the Creeds, and affirmed by the undisputed General Councils;—and by drawing each of us closer to our common Lord, by giving ourselves to much prayer and intercession, by the cultivation of a spirit of charity, and a love of the Lord's appearing."

"Day taken up with Declaration," Bishop Gray writes; "did not finish it. General Councils excluded from first part. House divided about it. Felt the discussion did not promise well. I moved an amendment that they should be brought in in the first clause, where we spoke of the basis on which future reunion of Christendom might take place. Archbishop consented that a Committee should be formed, both to consider the terms of Declaration, and to prepare a Pastoral *ad fidelium*. We met after breaking up to consider these matters. The Bishop of Oxford produced a Pastoral which, at the Archbishop's request, he had sketched. Debate upon it, and deferred final approbation till to-morrow. All thought it very good. Got the Bishop of Ely to work with me to get the General Councils recognised. Dined with a large party at Fulham (Bishop of London's).

"*September 25th.*—Short night. Walked down to Lambeth by eleven o'clock. Long discussion again about Declaration. Postponed it for the Colonial Church work. Bishop of New

Zealand moved, one by one, the Resolutions we had agreed upon among ourselves. Hard fight with the Bishops of London and S. David's about Synods, and their relations. To-day the former objected to our agreeing to a system of Synods culminating in an Œcumenical Synod. I showed him the language of Convocation upon the point. He disputed it, but struggled in vain. We defeated him, affirming the principle, and leaving details for a Committee upon which I am.

"We had then a great debate on the Natal question. The Bishop of New Zealand moved, and the Bishop of Montreal seconded, the Resolution agreed to at the Meeting of English and African Bishops, to which I had given a very reluctant assent, because I was told that I was no fit judge of a matter in which I was personally so deeply concerned." [The Resolution was given above, p. 344.]

"The Bishop of S. David's rose to object, but the Bishop of Vermont (Hopkins), presiding Bishop of the American Church, rose at the same time, said that he was altogether dissatisfied with the Resolution, which seemed to hold the balance even between the Bishop of Cape Town and Dr. Colenso; that all the American Bishops had accepted the Metropolitan's sentence, and that he believed the great majority of Bishops were prepared to do so. He moved a long amendment to that effect.

"The Bishop of S. David's then rose to protest against carrying on the discussion at all;—asked the Archbishop whether he had not engaged to him and others that the Colenso question should not be discussed? He and the Bishop of London pressed the unfairness of breaking an engagement. Others said they had come from the ends of the earth to what they believed would be a free discussion;—that men everywhere believed that this would form a main subject for deliberation;—that the Canadian, the whole of the American Church, and the whole of the English, Home and Colonial, were looking for some decision;—that the addresses which had come in when the suspicion arose that it was about to be passed over, were evidence of the deep feeling on the subject. The Archbishop has no firm hand in guiding a meeting, and it is perhaps well that, through-

out these days, he let all say their say; as a safety-valve was much needed for all. During the discussion the Bishop of S. Andrews proposed another amendment similar to the Bishop of Vermont's, but more condensed, yet still containing too much. At length the Archbishop rose to give his decision, but not until I had stated what was the proposition which I meant to submit, if his Grace permitted me to do so,—*i.e.* 'That this Conference, while pronouncing no opinion upon any question as to legal rights, acknowledges and accepts the spiritual sentence pronounced by the Metropolitan of South Africa upon the Right Rev. J. W. Colenso, D.D., Bishop of Natal.'

"The Archbishop ruled that it would be a violation of an understood arrangement with some English Bishops if he allowed any of the three amendments to be put,—Bishop Hopkins', S. Andrews', or mine; that the utmost he could allow was the Resolution agreed to at the Bishops' meeting summoned to consider the question;—that he himself, however, objected to parts of that Resolution, which might be construed as holding the balance even between the Bishop of Cape Town and Dr. Colenso, and requested these might be struck out. They were struck out, and the Resolution was passed by a large majority, the dissentients being the Bishops who wished for the amendments. I said but little throughout these discussions, feeling that it was to so great an extent a personal matter with me; but before the Resolution was put, I said to the Archbishop that I accepted, and bowed to his Grace's decision, however grieved I was at it. I had declared beforehand that I should do so, and would therefore sit down. I was at the moment very doubtful as to the proper course to be pursued. So desultory have been our proceedings, that the discussion might easily have been prolonged, and I have no doubt but that my amendment would have been carried by an overwhelming majority, unless our universal desire to show respect to the Archbishop, so meek, and kind, and fair, and considerate for all, had prevented many from voting at all."

After the debate the Bishop of Labuan (Dr. Colenso's brother-in-law) and others went up to the Bishop of Cape Town to

thank him for his moderation and forbearance; while the Bishop of Salisbury and others remonstrated with him for having yielded. The American Bishops said they had expected to hear a full statement of the whole case, and were disappointed.

"To this hour," Bishop Gray wrote, "I cannot decide for myself whether I did right or wrong. The opportunity of freeing the Church from all complicity with heresy may have passed away for ever;—on the other hand, calm inquiry, delay, caution, and forbearance, will give greater weight to ultimate proceedings in the eye of the world, if the Report of the Committee should lead to Church action at our adjourned Conference. I did what I deemed right at the moment in the sight of God. If I have erred, may He forgive me. Upon me be the blame, and not upon the Church, which was ready to have done its duty."

After the meeting the Conference was so dissatisfied with the proceeding, that fifty-five Bishops signed the following Declaration: "We, the undersigned Bishops, declare our acceptance of the sentence pronounced upon Dr. Colenso by the Metropolitan of South Africa, with his Suffragans, as being spiritually a valid sentence."

On Thursday, September 25th, the Conference debated the Bishop of New Zealand's Resolution as to a Board of Reference or Spiritual tribunal of final appeal and decision in all matters of faith, for all branches of Anglican Communion, which after some discussion was withdrawn from want of time. The Conference next discussed the question of a Court of final appeal for all Colonial Churches, and referred the matter to a committee intended to consider "the constitution of a voluntary spiritual tribunal in England, to which cases involving doctrine might be referred by appeal from tribunals for the exercise of discipline in each province of the Colonial Church."

"S. David's and London were, as usual, the chief objectors. Adopted the amended form of Declaration; which now satisfies me. The hope of future union is to be found in the maintenance of the faith in its purity and integrity as taught in the Word of God; summed up in the Creeds, and defined by the undisputed

General Councils of the Church, thus excluding the Seventh, which sanctioned image-worship, and was disputed by the Council of Frankfort.

"Friday, September 27th, Pastoral read and unanimously adopted by the Synod, all standing up to express assent; then the Archbishop called up each Bishop according to his seniority to sign it.[1] . . . A discussion arose about printing; it was

[1] The Pastoral Letter is as follows :—

"To the Faithful in Christ Jesus, the Priests and Deacons, and the Lay members of the Church of Christ in communion with the Anglican branch of the Church Catholic.

"We, the undersigned Bishops gathered under the good Providence of God for prayer and conference at Lambeth, pray for you that ye may obtain grace, mercy, and peace, from God our Father and from the Lord Jesus Christ our Saviour. We give thanks to God, brethren beloved, for the Faith in our Lord Jesus Christ and the love towards the Saints which hath abounded amongst you; and for the knowledge of Christ which through you hath been spread abroad amongst the most vigorous races of the earth. And with one mouth we make our supplications to God, even the Father, that by the power of the Holy Ghost He would strengthen us with His might, to amend among us the things which are amiss, to supply the things which are lacking, and to reach forth unto higher measures of love and zeal in worshipping Him, and in making known His Name: and we pray that in His good time He would give back unto His whole Church the blessed gift of unity in truth. And now we exhort you in love that ye keep whole and undefiled the Faith once delivered to the Saints, as ye have received it of the Lord Jesus. We intreat you to watch and pray, and to strive heartily with us against the frauds and subtleties wherewith the Faith hath been aforetime and is now assailed. We beseech you to hold fast as the sure Word of God all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, and that by diligent study of these oracles of God, praying in the Holy Ghost, ye seek to know more of the Lord Jesus Christ our Saviour, ever to be adored and worshipped, Whom they reveal unto us, and of the Will of God which they declare. Furthermore, we intreat you to guard yourselves and yours against the growing superstitions and additions with which in these latter days the Truth of God hath been overlaid; as otherwise, so especially by the pretension to universal sovereignty over God's heritage asserted for the See of Rome, and by the practical exaltation of the Blessed Virgin Mary as Mediator in the place of her Divine Son, and by the addressing of prayer to her as intercessor between God and man. Of such beware, we beseech you, knowing that the jealous God giveth not His Honour to another. Build yourselves up, therefore, beloved, in your most holy Faith; grow in grace and in the knowledge and love of Jesus Christ our Lord. Show forth before all men by your faith, self-denial, purity, and godly conversation, as well as by your labours for the people among whom God hath so widely spread you, and by the setting forth of His Gospel to the unbelievers and the heathen, that ye are indeed the servants of Him Who died for us to reconcile His Father to us, and to be a sacrifice for the sins of the whole

ultimately agreed to publish only the Resolutions,[1] but the whole of the debates are to be laid up in the archives in Lambeth Library, and to be accessible to all; a wise conclusion in my judgment. I should be very sorry to see all the debates published.

"We referred to the Archbishop the preparation of letters commendatory. . . . Before I could consent to refer the question

world. Brethren beloved, with one voice we warn you; the time is short, the Lord cometh; watch and be sober. Abide stedfast in the Communion of Saints wherein God hath granted you a place. Seek in faith for oneness with Christ in the Blessed Sacrament of His Body and Blood. Hold fast the Creeds, and the pure worship and order, which of God's grace ye have inherited from the Primitive Church. Beware of causing divisions contrary to the doctrine ye have received. Pray and seek for unity among yourselves, and among all the faithful in Christ Jesus; and the Good Lord make you perfect, and keep your bodies, souls, and spirits, until the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ."

[1] "RESOLUTION I. That it appears to us expedient, for the purpose of maintaining brotherly intercommunion, that all cases of establishment of new Sees, and appointment of new Bishops, be certified to all Archbishops and Metropolitans and all presiding Bishops of the Anglican Communion.

"II. That, having regard to the conditions under which intercommunion between members of the Church passing from one distant Diocese to another may be duly maintained, we hereby declare it desirable—

"(1.) That forms of letters commendatory on behalf of Clergymen visiting other Dioceses be drawn up and agreed upon.

"(2.) That a form of Letters commendatory for lay members of the Church be in like manner prepared.

"(3.) That his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury be pleased to undertake the preparation of such forms.

"III. That a Committee be appointed to draw up a Pastoral Address to all members of the Church in Christ in communion with the Anglican branch of the Church Catholic, to be agreed upon by the assembled Bishops, and to be published as soon as possible after the last sitting of the Conference.

"IV. That, in the opinion of this Conference, unity in faith and discipline will be best maintained among the several branches of the Anglican Communion, by due and canonical subordination of the Synods of the several branches to the higher authority of a Synod or Synods above them.

"V. That a Committee of seven members (with power to add to their number, and to obtain the assistance of men learned in ecclesiastical and canon law) be appointed to inquire into and report upon the subject of the relations and functions of such Synods, and that such report be forwarded to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury with a request that, if possible, it may be communicated to an adjourned meeting of this Conference.

"VI. That in the judgment of the Bishops now assembled, the whole Anglican Communion is deeply injured by the present condition of the Church in Natal;

of the election of Bishops to a committee, I said that I must ask the Conference to agree to one addition to it, which I had intended to propose—viz., That this Conference accepted and adopted the wise decision of the Convocation of Canterbury as to the appointment of another Bishop to Natal;—that I did not think there ought to be, and did not apprehend there would be, any opposition to this. The proposal gave rise to a warm

and that a Committee be now appointed at this general meeting to report on the best mode by which the Church may be delivered from the continuance of this scandal, and the true Faith maintained. That such report be forwarded to his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, with the request that he will be pleased to transmit the same to all the Bishops of the Anglican Communion, and to ask for their judgment thereupon.

"VII. That we who are here present do acquiesce in the resolution of the Convocation of Canterbury, passed June 29th, 1866, relating to the Diocese of Natal, to wit—

"'If it be decided that a new Bishop should be consecrated, as to the proper steps to be taken by the members of the Church, in the Province of Natal, for obtaining a new Bishop, it is the opinion of this House, *first*, that a formal instrument, declaratory of the doctrine and discipline of the Church of South Africa, should be prepared, which every Bishop, Priest, and Deacon, to be appointed to office, should be required to subscribe;—*secondly*, that a godly and well-learned man should be chosen by the Clergy, with the assent of the lay-communicants of the Church; and *thirdly*, that he should be presented for consecration, either to the Archbishop of Canterbury, if the aforesaid instrument should declare the doctrine and discipline of Christ as received by the United Church of England and Ireland, or to the Bishops of the Church of South Africa, according as hereafter may be judged to be most advisable and convenient.'

"VIII. That in order to the binding of the Churches of our Colonial Empire and the Missionary Churches beyond them in the closest union with the Mother Church, it is necessary that they receive and maintain without alteration the standards of Faith and doctrine now in use in that Church. That, nevertheless, each Province should have the right to make such adaptations and additions to the services of the Church as its peculiar circumstances may require; provided that no change or addition be made inconsistent with the spirit and principles of the Book of Common Prayer, and that all such changes be liable to revision by any Synod of the Anglican Communion in which the said Province shall be represented.

"IX. That the Committee appointed by Resolution V., with the addition of the names of the Bishops of London, S. David's, and Oxford, and all the Colonial Bishops, be instructed to consider the constitution of a voluntary spiritual tribunal to which questions of doctrine may be carried by appeal from the tribunals for the exercise of discipline in each Province of the Colonial Church, and that their report be forwarded to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, who is requested to communicate it to an adjourned meeting of this Conference.

discussion,—the Bishop of London vehemently opposing, aided by the Bishop of S. David's. I kept this time firm to my resolution,—expressed my great disappointment at the course already adopted by the Conference,—declared my belief that if nothing more than had been done took place, the Churches of our community would not be clear of complicity with heresy, and that I must ask his Grace to accept of my resignation, as I could not, however pained at the thought of severance from my Mother Church, hold communion with a body involved in what itself had declared in its own Synod to be heresy. Ultimately my Resolution was carried by a very large majority, three Bishops only holding up their hands against it. God be praised, but *mea culpa! mea culpa!* that my other Resolution was not also carried!

"We then referred all our other Colonial Resolutions, including that of the Court of Metropolitans and the election of Bishops, to our Committee. . . . We then repeated the Nicene Creed, sang the Gloria in Excelsis, received the Blessing, and the session closed, the Archbishop leaving it uncertain when the adjourned meeting would take place. A photographer was waiting to catch us as we emerged, and in a few minutes took pictures of the group assembled round the door.

"X. That the Resolutions submitted to this Conference relative to the discipline to be exercised by Metropolitans, the Court of Metropolitans, the scheme for conducting the election of Bishops when not otherwise provided for, the declaration of submission to the regulation of Synods, and the question of what legislation should be proposed for the Colonial Churches, be referred to the Committee specified in the preceding Resolution.

"XI. That a special Committee be appointed to consider the Resolutions relative to the notification of proposed Missionary Bishoprics, and the subordination of Missionaries.

"XII. That the question of the bounds of jurisdiction of different Bishops, when any question may have arisen in regard to them, the question as to the obedience of Chaplains of the United Church of England and Ireland, on the Continent, and the Resolution submitted to the Conference relative to their return and admission into Home Dioceses, be referred to the Committee specified in the preceding Resolution.

"XIII. That we desire to render our hearty thanks to Almighty God for His Blessing vouchsafed to us in and by this Conference; and we desire to express our hope that this our meeting may hereafter be followed by other meetings, to be conducted in the same spirit of brotherly love."

"It was now five o'clock, and a large gathering for the conversazione had been waiting in S. James's Hall.[1] I walked round with Charlie to Westminster, to take the Bishop of S. Andrews' robes to Archdeacon Wordsworth's, and arrived later than the others. Selwyn was speaking, but as soon as I reached the platform, I was received with a great burst of cheering, which continued for a long time, and which was meant to express thankfulness for defence of the Faith. I was called upon to speak, and received another ovation. I announced the assent[2] which the Conference had given to the Canterbury

[1] This was held by S. P. G. . . "The warmest greeting was reserved for the Bishops of New Zealand and Cape Town."—*Guardian*, October 2, 1867.

[2] The Bishop of London published the following letter in the *Times*, September 28, 1867 :—"Sir—As the Bishop of Cape Town was by some understood to say, in his speech at S. James's Hall yesterday, that the Conference of Bishops at Lambeth had given its approval to the appointment of a new Bishop of Natal, I beg leave to refer all your readers who are interested in this subject to the carefully guarded words of the resolution actually adopted by the Conference, which will, I believe, soon be published.—A. C. London." To which the Bishop of Cape Town replied : "Sir—The Bishop of London has sent me a copy of a letter which he has addressed to you with reference to what I was supposed to have said at S. James's Hall as to the appointment of a Bishop to Natal. What I meant to say, and I believe did say, on that occasion, was that the Conference had approved and accepted as its own the conclusions arrived at by both Houses of the Convocation of Canterbury on this subject. The facts are these." (Here the Bishop quotes the questions put by the Church of Natal to Convocation, see page 265 ; and the replies of Convocation, going on to say), "The Conference has now given the same reply. The state of the case is therefore as follows : Any Bishop elected and consecrated in conformity with the rules laid down in these replies will not only be recognised as a Bishop in communion with the Church of England, but by the Bishops of all branches of the Anglican Communion throughout the world. All doubt and difficulty, therefore, in the way of the consecration of another Bishop for the much tried and oppressed Church in Natal is now removed." A leader in the *Times*, reviling the Bishop of Cape Town, appeared October 4th, to which the Bishop replied as follows :—

. . . "As that article contains several mistakes, I address a few lines to you on the subject.

"I. I did not mean to say, and I believe did not say, at S. James's Hall, that the Primate recommended anything or anyone. I merely wished to say that his Grace concurred in the view taken by the Conference, and that there was now no further impediment in the way of the consecration of a faithful Bishop for Natal. The assent of the Churches of our communion was thought to be desirable, if not essential. That assent has now been given. Not only has the Convocation of Canterbury given its judgment in the matter, but the Bishops of all the Churches

Resolutions, and said that the Archbishop was now prepared to recommend one to go out as Bishop to Natal, and reminded the Church that an income was still needed. I also urged the claims of the great Church Societies to one common building worthy of the Church of England, and spoke with reference to what a previous speaker had said of the hope of the reunion of Christendom, the fair prospects so far as the East was concerned, the little encouragement from the temper of the Roman Hierarchy, the necessity of a general Council when men's

of the Anglican Communion assembled at Lambeth have now done the same. I did not allude to legal difficulties, because I believe there are none. The Colonial Churches are pronounced to be voluntary associations. They have all the rights of voluntary bodies. They ask no more. They will be content with nothing less.

"II. Next you say that three questions were put to Convocation, and that I ought to have given the answers to these three questions, whereas I omitted the first. My reply is that I had not to give the course pursued by Convocation, or to refer to the opinion therein delivered, but to state the course pursued by the Conference at Lambeth. The Conference was asked whether it assented to the opinion given by Convocation as to the appointment of another Bishop. It replied that it did, and it directed that the answers given in the two resolutions, or, as the Bishop of London supposed, in the third Resolution only, should be appended to its vote. You will see, therefore, that you are unjust to me when you say that a resolution with which the Conference did not concern itself 'ought not to have been omitted' by me, when stating what the Conference had done.

"III. Your comments on the proceedings of Convocation are precisely of the same character as those made by the Dean of Westminster, in his preface to his speech in Convocation, the errors of which I have already publicly exposed. With these proceedings, however, I have nothing to do. Convocation will, if needed, I doubt not, defend itself. Meantime, I would suggest that it is hardly worthy of the Dean's position to refer so frequently to them. If he doubts what the mind of Convocation is in this matter, I trust that he will refer the question again to it for revision.

"IV. It is not for me to defend the temper in which I have dealt with the very trying and difficult questions with which I have had to deal. I am quite aware that great imperfection attends upon all I say or do; but I can say before God that in the discharge of a sad duty I have felt not any anger or bitterness, as some of Dr. Colenso's friends are fond of asserting, but deep pain and sorrow of soul. At the Conference, when these trying questions were discussed, I was thanked by many Bishops, Dr. Colenso's brother-in-law included, for the moderation shown by me, and blamed by others for not saying more than I did.—Your obedient servant,

"R. CAPETOWN.

"Wolverhampton, October 4th."

There was a prolongation of this discussion in the *Times;* but as nothing new or important was said, or perhaps could be said, it is not thought necessary to reproduce it here.

minds should be ripe for it, which, however, we should probably not live to see. About £200 a year was promised in the room towards the support of the new Bishop.

"*Saturday, September 28th,* Service at Lambeth at 11 o'clock, the Bishops walking in procession from the Palace to the Church. The Bishop of Montreal preached a plain, sensible sermon. I think there were about 400 communicants."

Space forbids us to dwell at length upon this important Conference, the results of which may well be summed up in the words of the Scottish Primus (Eden, 1867), who, while remarking that these results will not all be immediately seen in their fulness, went on to say: "One such, however, is that it has for ever dissipated that erroneous and Erastian notion that the Church of England could not recognise any man for a true Bishop who was not made so by the authority of the Sovereign. In this assembly one-third at least of the Bishops present were not so made, nor was any distinction recognised between the Bishops of an established or of an unestablished Church,—all sat mingled together, all were alike equal as parts of the one Episcopate. Nor could the fact be passed over, which testifies to a principle of the first importance in considering the question of the revival of intercommunion between different Churches, that the existence of different liturgies in Churches is no bar to their intercommunion. One other result of this Conference will be to show that proved heresy separates a Bishop from communion with the Anglican Church in every part of the world. One chair was vacant in that assembly which should have been filled by a Bishop of the Church in South Africa. But that Bishop had been deposed for heresy by ecclesiastical authority. That deposition was recognised by the Bishops of the Anglican Communion assembled at Lambeth, and no sound of disapproval was heard from any quarter in that great assembly when the Archbishop informed us that he had sent no invitation to Dr. Colenso."

Directly the service at Lambeth was over, Bishop Gray went off to the Euston station where his wife was waiting for him, and they went to Wolverhampton, where the Church Con-

gress was about to meet. On the Sunday (Michaelmas Day) the Bishop preached at Penn in the morning, and at Wolverhampton in the evening, when a dense crowd assembled to hear him. It was said that 2,000 people were present, and hundreds were sent away unable to get in. The next day, September 30th, the Bishop preached at S. Michael's, Coventry, returning to Wolverhampton for the opening service of the Congress on October 1st. His Journal mentions "an admirable opening sermon from the Dean of Norwich. The whole day taken up with attending the meetings, receiving greetings, and answering letters. *October 2nd,* Day as yesterday. Read a paper on home and foreign organisation for mission work." The reporters say that the Bishop met with a most exciting reception, the entire audience rising and cheering him enthusiastically. On the next day there was a meeting for the purpose of presenting the Bishop with a pastoral staff. No public announcehad been made of it, but "the room was crowded to suffocation, and a tone of unusual enthusiasm characterised the whole assembly," according to the newspapers. The staff, designed by Mr. Butterfield, is ebony—cross and foot being of gold set with precious stones;—an Agnus Dei in relief on one side of the cross, and a very large carbuncle on the other.

Mr. Beresford Hope, M.P., made a warm speech, which went to the hearts of all present. What the Bishop of Cape Town has been in the defence of the truth in his lion-like zeal, his energy, and his unselfishness, they all knew, he said; but he could go back to years and years ago, before all these late troubles had come, and remember how the Bishop gave himself then, body and soul, to his work. Presenting the crozier, Mr. Hope went on to say that, "Of old the good tradition of the Christian Church was that, as the Diocesan carries a crook, so the Archbishop or Metropolitan raises the Cross on high as the standard for all, as well Bishop, as well Priest, as well Deacon, as well Laity, to follow. With the cross in his hand and the cross in his heart, the Metropolitan is strong in his weakness, and powerful in the Blood of his Crucified Lord. . . . You, my Lord Metropolitan of Cape Town, will go forward with the

cross thus. In the southern hemisphere do we not see this touching symbol of our faith planted in the heavens themselves? What are the stars which guide the wanderer on the ocean when he has passed the equator and when the pole-star has vanished from his sight? It is the Southern Cross!"

Several other speakers followed, among whom we must only find room to specify the Bishop of Tennessee (Dr. Quintard). He said, amid much cheering,

"My dear Lord and Brother, it has been very truly said that great principles are dearly bought, and that great truths are only advanced by mighty struggles. In such a struggle you have been engaged, and you have, I believe, come off more than conqueror. I have followed you, as a multitude of your brethren have done in all quarters of the world, through the trials which have beset your path of duty; and we have felt how one after another of your sufferings have entered into your very soul. I stand here as a Bishop of that Church, which upon this point has given forth no uncertain sound. Not only at our General Convocation in 1865 was a resolution passed and a letter sent to the Archbishop of Canterbury on the subject, but on our arrival in this country, in the palace of Lambeth where our Episcopacy originated—for it was there that our saintly White was consecrated for the American Church—we put our names to a paper declaring that the acts of the Bishop of Cape Town were valid, and that Dr. Colenso is excommunicate. I have no hesitation in saying that we in America cannot exactly comprehend how a man can be excommunicate in the Church and not excommunicate in the State! Woe be to our branch of the Church, indeed, when she shall fail for any earthly considerations to stand up and give her approval clearly of such a pastor of Christ's flock as the Bishop of Cape Town! . . . . I rejoice that I have an opportunity of giving him my assurance of the fact—for it is a fact—that his name is a household word in every Church family in America. I doubt whether there is a Bishop of the American Church better known among us than the Metropolitan of Cape Town. He will now go forth once more to his home and to his labour, but the con-

flict is not over, any more than in the Christian life the warfare is won by a single battle. This crozier will admonish him to do valiantly and right gloriously for the flock of Christ, and in all his trials and difficulties it will remind him that English hearts go with him,—ay, and better than English hearts, the heart of the Catholic Church throughout the broad world."

The Bishop, in thanking the friends around him, characteristically told them that the prominent feeling in his mind was humiliation. He could not help thinking what a primitive Bishop would have felt at being praised by a body of the faithful, simply because he had done his duty to his Lord and the Church. In the early days of the Christian Church it would have been taken for granted that he would do so. The Metropolitan went on to say that no fitter present could be made to a Christian Bishop. He trusted he might ever take his own place at the foot of the Cross, looking up to Him Who hangs thereon. Bishop Gray then said that this was his birthday—he that day entered on his fifty-ninth year, and was in the twenty-first of his Episcopate. He could not but feel that it was drawing to a close. After dwelling a short time on the history of his special troubles in Africa, he pronounced a fervent blessing on all, and the meeting separated, deeply moved. His private Journal of that day says, "Enter to-day my fifty-ninth year. The time is short—may I remember this, and live in the recollection of it."

Amid all the bustle and excitement, the Bishop found time to write the following letter to his little daughter left at the Cape with her governess:—

"Wolverhampton, October 3rd, 1867.

"My dearest Flossy—I write to you amid great distraction a few lines, during the sitting of the Congress, on my birthday. We are all here, and I wish, dearest child, that you could be with us. . . . I have had a very exciting and anxious time at the Conference, but I hope now that the chief troubles are over. There is, however, plenty of work before me. I have sermons

and meetings already fixed for nearly every day for a very long time, and I suppose that I shall continue at this work almost daily as long as I am in England, but I sometimes fear I shall not stand the work. To-day I am to receive a great address, and a Pastoral Staff, and other things. I would shrink from all this if I could, but I cannot. From here we go to South Wales for Sunday, then back to the north, for Durham, Northumberland, and Yorkshire; then to London for committee meetings, etc. We have no resting place, and shall hardly be two days anywhere at one time. . . . You can read the History of Philip II. I am glad that you like the Sunday school. You can give little prizes for me if you wish it, and Fanny will pay for them. Be earnest, my child, in prayer. Pray at other times than at night and morning. Watch over your temper. Give my kind regards to Miss Moir, and remembrances to the servants.—Ever your affectionate father, R. CAPETOWN.

"I send you my blessing on my birthday."

To the Dean of Cape Town Bishop Gray wrote:

"Wolverhampton, October 2nd.

"It is impossible to write fully to you. I have not had five minutes to myself at any one time for a month past. . . . Under God, I think the indignation aroused when it was known that the question was to be shirked [at Lambeth], and the firm attitude of the Americans, saved us. I believe that I could have carried my amendment, if I had opposed the Archbishop. . . . I have a wide field for work if I can go through it; nearly all England is now open to me. I have had invitations from full 300 parishes. I have been nearly done up."

"*October 4th,* Day as before, except that I had to go out to reply to a savage article in the *Times*, evidently by ——.[1] Much worn and wearied by continued excitement. People all very kind and hearty."

[1] The *Times* now refused to insert the Bishop's replies to the attacks upon him which it admitted—a line suggestive of a consciously weak cause surely.

From Wolverhamption the Bishop went to Archdeacon Clark, near Tenby, for meetings and preachings;—thence to Hereford, staying with Lady Emily Foley. A tour in the North in behalf of his Diocese followed, the Bishop being received everywhere with a warmth and enthusiasm which could not but cheer him, while he was greatly struck by the advanced tone of religion which met him. "Ten years ago, one could not have had such a service or such a congregation on a week day," he wrote from Scarborough. "The religious mind of England is evidently going in for greatly improved and more hearty services." The visit to all his old haunts in Durham and elsewhere was marred by the annoyance of spiteful articles in the *Times*—vexatious, however false,—the more so as that paper "continued to refuse to publish the refutations to its slanders." It seems unnecessary to give the letters here (they appeared in the *Standard* and *Guardian* at the time), inasmuch as all they said and the points they met have been already dealt with. Sleepless nights, too, were as usual entailed by anxiety and over-fatigue, the inevitable result of incessant work and harass. At Remington (where he arrived sermonless, Mrs. Gray having by mistake carried off his bag containing the sermon when she left him at Alnwick) he found a somewhat unusual procession —some thirty volunteers having spontaneously joined the intended church procession, some of them throwing surplices over their uniform, and entering the choir.

Returning south, the Bishop went (October 30th) to Ely, where he enjoyed both the cordial kindness of the Bishop and Mrs. Harold Brown, and the beauty of the Cathedral. Amid all the toil in which he was engaged, a considerable addition came upon the Bishop at this time, in the unsettled state of the question who was to be the new Bishop of Natal. The Archbishop had recently counselled Mr. Butler not to accept his election, on the ground that he was looked upon by many as an "extreme" man, and that in the existing state of Natal, a supposed party man would have less power for good than another. Immediately after the Lambeth Conference separated Bishop Gray had written to Mr. Butler as follows:—

"21 Norfolk Square, September 28th, 1867.

"My dear Mr. Butler—I give you the earliest announcement of what has passed, with regard to Natal and yourself, in and out of Conference.

"I. As to the Church of that place. We had a preliminary meeting of Bishops, before the Congress, to consider what should be done, and it was agreed to submit a resolution to the Conference on the subject, which included the appointment of a Committee to decide on what should be done, and report to the adjourned Conference. The Conference altered the resolution on points which left the question, as was thought, too open. The Committee is to report to the Archbishop, and their report to be submitted to all Bishops of the Anglican Communion.

"II. The Conference has accepted and abides by the counsel tendered by the Province of Canterbury last year, as to the election of a Bishop, and appends their two resolutions to its own. These say that the election of a Bishop by the Church in Natal will not interrupt the communion of that Church with the Church of England, and point out a course to be followed in the election, which has been followed in yours.

"III. The Archbishop and the Bishop of Oxford are prepared to tell you that the hindrances, which led them to hesitate as to your course, are removed. But, of course, you will hear from them, and my intimation is confidential. The Archbishop subscribes to the support of the Bishop; and steps are already being taken to provide an income.

"There is only one other point upon which I ought to touch. A brother Clergyman has been talking on the subject of your views on the Eucharist, wishing his fears to be communicated to me. You will, I am sure, frankly and freely tell me if you have come to the conclusion that you cannot subscribe to the teaching of the Church of England on the subject, as that teaching is to be gathered from her various formularies. I myself believe that while distinct and emphatic on the point of transubstantiation, her language admits of a wide range of view within her pale on what are called "pious opinions." I

have not the least wish to narrow the liberty which she allows, and all that I have a right to ask is, Whether there is a conscious departure from her teaching, or an overstepping of the limits which she permits? I do not believe there is. I am sure that you would have told me before this, if such were the case. But I ask, because of the responsibility which attaches to my office, and the great interests involved.

"Though I grieve very much for your dear wife and friends, you will, I trust, be my fellow-labourer in my feeble efforts to plant the Kingdom of our Lord, in the fulness of its strength and beauty, in Africa. I cannot lament for you. You will have a heavier cross to bear than you have ever yet borne. You will be called to fill up some portion of the sufferings and afflictions of your Lord. You will have to wrestle not against the world only, but principalities and powers. But you will win a crown, and witness for Christ; and hand on the faith in Natal unimpaired. One thing only, my dear friend, I am anxious about. You must feel how weak in the faith your future flock is, and must long continue to be. They must be regarded as babes in Christ—be fed with milk and not with strong meat, until able to bear it. I should deeply lament, if anything were to throw poor waverers, ill instructed in the Faith, into the arms of the unbeliever. But we can talk over all these things hereafter.

"Of course, at present, I cannot say what is the next step to be taken. All that I am anxious about is that you should be consecrated before the adjourned Synod reassembles, and take your seat at it. I have had no time to think yet. If you have any suggestions to offer, pray make them.—Believe me ever, faithfully yours, R. CAPETOWN."

On October 6th the Metropolitan wrote again from Tenby, expressing the same hope as in the last letter, and saying that he was in communication with others about the question of consecration in its legal aspect; and again from Stainton Grange, October 15th. November 3rd he wrote from Manchester:

"My dear Mr. Butler—I am deeply grieved by your note. The delay in hearing from you aroused my apprehensions. I have no right to press the Archbishop, or to seem to force his acquiescence, in a course which he does not approve; but I have written to him, and put before him the difficulties to which his decision subjects us, and your desire for an interview. Will you let me have a copy of their (Archbishop and Bishop of Oxford) last joint letter to you? I thought that it committed the Archbishop. I have told the Archbishop that I can see nothing in the paper which you have signed which exceeds the limits allowed by the Church of England. There are, however, I need scarce say, some that think otherwise. Some of these have written to me, and probably to the Archbishop.—Believe me ever," etc.

"Shrewsbury, November 13th, 1867.

"My dear Mr. Butler—I heard from the Archbishop yesterday, and by the same post wrote to the African Bishops to meet me to-morrow in London, that we might take counsel together on this grave matter. I did not wish to write to you till I had seen them, and until I had heard from the Bishop of Oxford, to whom I have written, but from whom I have not yet heard. I am anxious to know whether he thinks that all hopes about you must be given up, in consequence of the Archbishop's views, before taking any definite step. I have at the same time, I need scarce say, felt very much for you, and have been most anxious to write to remove all painful suspense, but I thought that you would feel that nothing but my own state of uncertainty kept me silent. I did not think that the Archbishop would change his view, and he has not. He expresses his deep regret that he could not 'recommend' you to go out, —thinks that your doing so 'would tend rather to complicate matters than to settle them;' and that owing to the step you took in signing that document on the Eucharist.[1] He says, 'I

[1] A document put forth in June 1867, by certain Priests of the Church of England, vindicating themselves from the charge of disloyalty to their Mother Church, and putting forward clearly their belief as to the Holy Eucharist. (Appendix No. IX.)

had no right to condemn the doctrine therein propounded, but neither did I choose to endorse it; nor has anybody a right to call upon me to do so. I told Mr. Butler that I was ready to answer his two questions in the affirmative, but beyond that I could not advance without compromising myself in a way that I had no right to be called upon to do.'

"He says that in your first letter you 'thanked him for his advice, and announced great acquiescence in it. He is sorry to find that you are hurt, but he does not think that any personal explanations would do away with the impressions of others; that they will form their opinion by the document you have signed, and not by private explanations to him; and that he still apprehends that your going forth would create 'division of opinion among the faithful members of the Church in Natal.' On this ground he 'could not recommend you to go forth. But' (he adds) 'I am still of the same mind that a Bishop ought to go forth, and I shall cordially support the South African Bishops should they proceed to consecration.'

"Dr. Pusey has written to me to propose that I should consecrate you as my coadjutor, and that as such you should take present charge of Natal. But independently of the fact that you are less likely to be willing to go forth when 'dissuaded' by the Archbishop than you were when you felt that something more than acquiescence was needed, and that a positive recommendation was required, I have told him that (if he differs, of course I am wrong) such an act has always appeared to me to be uncanonical. I do not see that I have any right to supersede an election, or to substitute some other arrangement for a Diocesan Bishop. I am sure that the Natal Clergy and Laity would resent our doing so. And the more so because they have themselves limited our authority in this matter. They have elected you; the Bishops of the Province have confirmed the election. *I* cannot set these acts aside; but they have decided that if anything should prevent your going out, the Bishop of Graham's Town and myself, with the concurrence of the Archbishop, are to choose another. This, it seems to me, is the only course open to us, if you cannot go out as

Diocesan Bishop. I fear that it is coming to this, that we are not to have you, and I need hardly tell you that I *very* deeply regret it; for, in spite of the document (and your signature *would* have been a hindrance to your influence in the present state of things), I should have been thankful if it had been decided for you to go. . . I would wish that any [published] letter from me should be written after I had taken counsel with the other Bishops of the Province.—Believe me ever, my dear friend, faithfully and affectionately yours,

"R. CAPETOWN."

On November 12th Bishop Gray records in his Journal the receipt of "a very nice letter from the Archbishop, saying that he felt unable to *recommend* Butler to go out, believing that his having signed the paper on the Eucharist would tend to complicate rather than settle matters in Natal. All that he could do would be to acquiesce. This practically settles the matter. All must be begun *de novo*. The Archbishop still thinks that a Bishop must go out, and will give every help in his power to the African Bishops."

On the 14th he wrote to Mr. Butler: "If you publish the Archbishop's letter to you, ought you with it not to publish the joint letter of his Grace and the Bishop of Oxford acquiescing in your going? It seems important for the sake of the Church that it should be understood that what the Archbishop shrinks from is the responsibility of *recommending* you to go. . . . His letter to me puts his view in a fair light. . . . God help us and guide us. I feel much down-hearted at having to go over the whole work again, and I feel also the pain caused to you."

Mr. Butler sent the following letter to the *Guardian* of November 21, 1867:—

"Sir—Will you have the kindness to publish the accompanying extract from a letter received by me from the Archbishop of Canterbury?

"When, at the end of last year, the news of my election to the See of Pieter Maritzburg first reached me, the circumstances

of the case appeared to me so novel and so important that I felt myself bound in common prudence to look to those for counsel who, from their position of authority, were most able both to give it, and also to assist in meeting the difficulties which could not fail to surround an effort, made in the face of keen and intelligent opposition, to win for the Church in the Colonies her true and rightful privilege of unfettered religious action. I therefore placed myself unreservedly at the disposal of his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury. He has come to the conclusion, after—it cannot be doubted—much careful consideration, that some other than I will best satisfy the requirements of the Diocese, and it would be both ungrateful and unbecoming in me to dispute his decision. It will be seen, therefore, that, whatever regret or pain this somewhat unexpected result has caused, I have no course left but to decline the honourable, if anxious, post of Bishop over the orthodox members of the Church of Natal. WILLIAM BUTLER.

"Wantage Vicarage, November 18th, 1867."

"'Addington Park, October 29th, 1867.

"'I have come to the conclusion that I ought to dissuade you from availing yourself of your election to the See of Pieter-Maritzburg. To my mind, the appointment of any one of very marked opinions to the See, would be open to serious objections, and it would be better to select some one more calculated to meet the various shades of religious opinion that exist among faithful members of the Church of England in the Colony of Natal.'"

The Bishop of Oxford wrote: "No doubt, so far as we can see, if our dear Archbishop had seen his way to stand firm, Butler would wonderfully have restored all things."

It was a heavy time, and Bishop Gray felt sometimes as if he stood almost alone. "Though I have been called to defend the chief matters which Evangelicals pride themselves on maintaining more than others," he wrote (November 7th), "*e.g.* the inspiration of Holy Scripture, the doctrines of Original Sin, the sacrifice of our Lord upon the cross as an expiation for sin;

justification by faith, etc.—that school not only stands aloof and renders me no support, but even strives to induce others to do so. It was only the other day that I was told that a party of Clergy of this school met together and denounced one of their number who had expressed his intention of being present at a sermon and meeting of mine. Oh the power of party spirit!"

On November 15th the Metropolitan met the Bishops of Graham's Town and Free State, and they agreed to lose no time in seeking for some one who might be able and willing to go to Natal in place of Mr. Butler. But it was a grievous disappointment to him, and he did not scruple to say so.[1] While diligently seeking a substitute, his innumerable engagements had to be kept, and the strain of perpetual preaching, and worse, talking, to be kept up. Now and then some unexpected outburst of genial love and sympathy would cheer him up (who was ever so open to cordiality and affection) as, *e.g.*,

[1] The Bishop wrote to Mr. Butler:

"February 7th, 1868.

"My dear Butler—I should hardly have thought that any one would put an unfavourable interpretation on my remark that 'circumstances of a personal nature' had led you after all to decline; but as this has been the case, I have no hesitation in saying that I believe you were fully prepared to make the sacrifice which the going out to Natal would have demanded of you, had it not been for expressions used by the Archbishop in a private letter to yourself, as to your individual fitness for the post in consequence of your having signed a certain document. The Archbishop formally announced to you, that in his judgment the difficulties which he and the Bishop of Oxford had raised to your acceptance of the post were removed. This letter you felt to be cold, as it undoubtedly was. You then wrote to his Grace seeking earnest counsel and encouragement in a great and trying undertaking. And this drew from his Grace the private letter relating to yourself personally, which led you, to our great regret, to feel that some other person than yourself ought to go forth to the work. That you were fully justified, under the circumstances, in coming to the decision which you did, I have never doubted; and that most men would feel that no other course was open to them, I am fully persuaded. I am very sorry that any expression of mine should have caused you uneasiness."

The Metropolitan wrote to the Bishop of Oxford:

"November 8th, 1867.

"Butler writes me word that he is still ready to go, if his Grace's difficulties can be removed. It is as unfair to him and his character, as it is to us, that all allusions to these personal disqualifications should have been reserved till the last."

when in the same dreary season some deputations from the Wells, Bristol, and Monmouthshire Church Unions came to offer their hearty thanks for the Metropolitan's defence of the Faith, a great deal of most warm and deep feeling kindling those who presented themselves. "Dear Bishop Gray!" (a member of that deputation of November 18th, 1867, writes) "How well I remember going over to Clifton from here and back in one day with a deputation from Monmouthshire we had got up, to present him with a red velvet purse containing some sovereigns and an address illuminated on a small piece of vellum (which pleasant task fell to my share); and how cold and foggy the weather was, and how hot and enthusiastic we were, and how tired we were afterwards; but all so pleased at having had a word with the champion of the Faith, and a shake of the hand from the good Bishop."

The Metropolitan returned to London, where meetings and committees at S. P. G. occupied him largely. In his Journal these are briefly recorded:—

"*November* 21*st*, All day in committee at S. P. G. Got through a fair amount of work. Great Ritual meeting in S. James's Hall.

"22*nd*, Another long day at S. P. G. Settled the Spiritual Court of final Appeal for Colonies, America, and Scotland. The Bishop of Illinois representing the United States, and urging strongly their desire for one common final Court of Appeal on matters of Faith. The whole battle was on the point as to whether Bishops and Priests could be judged by any other than their peers; whether any but Bishops could constitute the Court. Oxford, Gibraltar, Bishop Chapman, Christ Church, Free State, and I, were main supporters against—some were on neither side, but leaning against layman judging Bishops. We are indebted to the Bishop of Oxford for our existing Court, which is much the same as I at first proposed:—Elective by Bishops of Provinces: Canterbury, and York, each 3; Ireland, 2; Scotland, 2; America, 5; each Colonial Province, 2; Dioceses not included in a Province, 1. We have now gone through a great deal. Our Metropolitan Court was fixed upon

this principle. In each case we are to have assessors *as advisers.* In the final Court 3 theologians and 3 learned in the law.

"23*rd,* Bishops of Graham's Town and Free State to breakfast to discuss men for Natal. Went over all the names in my book and letters about them. Resolved that I should in first instance write to the Bishop of Gloucester about —— and ——. Went to meet Miss Mackenzie and Mr. Williams about a Missionary Bishop to Zululand; took them a paper signed by the three African Bishops commending the effort to the Church.

"26*th,* S. P. G. Long day in Committee over Synods. Bishop of Ely helped us much. Offered Natal to How.

"27*th,* Meeting again at S. P. G. Discussed the subject of a future General Council of the Anglican Communion; agreed upon terms, etc.

"28*th,* Morning given to Advent Sermons and letters amid interruptions. Afternoon seeing Badnall, Hawkins, Sir W. P. Wood, Mowbray, and Gladstone. Went at Gleig's request to War-Office to settle about military Chaplains coming under Bishops of Dioceses. S. P. G. Standing Committee.

"29*th,* S. P. G. at 11. Committee agreed upon the principles of a Bill respecting Colonial Churches to be laid before Government; also upon Declarations to be made by Colonial Bishops at Consecration, and by Clergy at Ordination and Consecration. How declines Natal. Wrote to offer the post to Mr. Hamilton of Bristol. Was told confidentially that New Zealand is to go to Lichfield. He was offered it a month ago and refused. Professor Lightfoot and Cookson, head of a House in Cambridge, were then offered it and declined. Then New Zealand was asked again, and said he was the servant of the Church, and that if the Archbishop asked him, he would do what was desired. The Archbishop has asked him, and he is to see the Queen to-morrow.

"*S. Andrew's Day,* Early Celebration at S. Michael's. The daily prayers are very fairly attended at eight o'clock every morning in this church. Service at S. Andrew's, Wells Street.

Crowded church; afterwards tea-drinking in the New Music Hall, Langham Place. I suppose 1200 present. Mission Women, Confraternity of Young Girls, of which there are three degrees, Adult Night Schools, Day Schools, Infant do.,—all very hearty. Then speeches; then music. Lord Nelson in the chair. He and Hope made effective speeches. Bishop Tozer and I said a few words.

"*December* 1*st*, Preached in the morning at S. Andrew's Church. Crowded to excess. A very glorious service; the finest choir, I believe, in London. There were three celebrations to-day, and six services. 330 Communicants. Dined with Mr. Webb, and had some talk about the condition of the Church in London, and Ritualism. . . . Walked to St. Cyprian's for the evening service. This is a little Mission Chapel constructed out of two small houses, a coal-shed, and a stable; would not hold 200. Mr. Gutch has a district of 3000 taken out of Llewellyn Davies' district of 29,000—itself a district taken out of Marylebone. Out of Mr. Davies' district 11,000 have been taken off and given to a church capable of holding 500, and this is all the provision for the spiritual needs of these souls which the Church has yet made. Mr. Gutch has a small Sisterhood living in part of the building;—the Clergy live in a Clergy house. Three are maintained by the Offertory. They cannot get a site for a church, and doubt whether Lord P——, who holds nearly all the property in the district, will sell one to them, though he has just done so for the Jews. The little chapel was crowded.

"2*nd*, Letters for Cape and Natal mail communicating the failure as regards Butler, and the steps now being taken.

"3*rd*, Interview with Mr. Dodd, who laid his views respecting legal proceedings *in re* Natal before the Archbishop, Bishop of Oxford, and myself. Committee afterwards all day *in re* legislation by Imperial Parliament for Colonial Churches.

"4*th*, 5*th*, Committee again all day.

"6*th*, Committee. Went down to Eton for dinner on Founder's Day. Five Eton Bishops present; much speechifying. Back late at night with Walpole.

"7*th*, Preparing Advent Sermons. To Cambridge in the afternoon; guests of the Master of Clare.

"8*th*, Long day. Celebration at 8 for Members of Propagation Union at S. Mary's. Sermon at 11 at All Saints.' University Sermon at 2. Dr. Prichard, President of the Astronomical Society, preached one of the Hulsean Lectures. Dined in Trinity College Hall. Service again at S. Mary's; preached for my Mission. Afterwards attended a meeting of the Propagation Union in King's; talked for an hour and a half. Got home very tired. Day intensely cold; thermometer down to 14°; snow falling, which affected the congregations.

"9*th*, Returning calls. Looked at the beautiful chapel in S. John's which Scott is building. It is to cost more than £40,000. Also at the New Courts of Trinity, for which the late Master left £70,000. Chapel at Kings'. Dined in hall afterwards, and attended a gathering at G. Williams' rooms of an Association for Theological Study and Good Works; addressed them. Public meeting afterwards at 8.30; Master of Magdalen in the Chair. . . . Religious feeling in Cambridge said to be lukewarm. Broad Church views somewhat spread, but no very definite unbelief; the younger men better than their immediate predecessors. The members of the University increasing. No great number of dissenters avail themselves of increased facilities.

"10th. Off at 7.30 A.M. to London for Lambeth Conference; reached just before 11. Twenty-nine[1] Bishops were present, fairly representing the body of English Bishops—Archbishop, London, Oxford, Ely, Lincoln, Chester, Rochester; of Colonials, the three Metropolitans, Graham's Town, Ontario, Nova Scotia, Perth, Gibraltar, Bishop Smith, Hobhouse, Free State, Honolulu, Tozer, Christ Church, Chapman, Labuan, Huron; of Scotch Bishops only the Primus. There were three Americans; Illinois, Tennessee, and ——.

"The first subject after prayer was the bringing up of the

[1] The printed report by the *Colonial Church Chronicle* says that there were forty Bishops present; but it seems probable that the Bishop of Cape Town is more nearly accurate.

Reports of Committees. The Archbishop first laid the Natal Report upon the table, and seemed to think that nothing could be done with it, or the eight other Reports. He and the Bishop of London had evidently been conferring on the subject and come to this conclusion, for the Bishop of London made a strong speech in support of this view, objecting on principle to the rump of the Conference settling anything, and urging that we could not discuss the Reports in a week. I rose to object, and to move the adoption of the first Report. Others spoke strongly to the same effect as myself, declaring that if we met only to receive reports and do nothing, we had better not have met at all: Primus of Scotland, Bishops of Oxford, Rochester, Nova Scotia, Montreal, Illinois, and others taking this view. Ultimately the Bishop of Montreal drew up a substitute, which the Bishop of Oxford seconded, to the effect that each Report be read and received, published, recommended earnestly to the consideration of the Church, and that the Committees be thanked for their care and labour. As the Bishop of London and others felt that there must be considerable discussion in each case, if the Reports were debated point by point, and many felt that there would not be time for this, I consented to withdraw my motion in favour of the Bishop of Montreal's. Each Report was then read, slightly canvassed, and the Resolution agreed upon adopted with regard to each. After going through eight, not including Natal, the Archbishop consulted the Synod whether the American Church should have a copy of the whole proceedings, including the debates. This was agreed to, but not for publication. As the proceedings seemed likely to close without any further reference to the Natal Report, I rose, and in, I fear, rather a warm speech, urged that it should be treated precisely as the other Reports had been dealt with; pointing out that if it were not done, and this were the only Report of which the Conference took no notice, it would be said that it had disapproved of it, and that it would go forth to the world at a great disadvantage as compared with the other Reports; that the shelving of this Report would be an act of injustice to the South African Church, and give fresh moral support to Dr.

Colenso; that he owed his present position very largely to the course pursued by the Bishops of the English Church, and that I trusted the Conference would never consent still more to weaken our hands; that I did not think there was anything in the objection that the Conference had ordered the Report to be made to the Archbishop and communicated by him to the Bishops of the Anglican Communion—this would still be done, but that if no action were taken with reference to the Report, we should feel aggrieved. The Bishop of Rochester seconded my motion; the Bishops of Nova Scotia, Illinois, Oxford, Montreal, and others warmly supported it.

"The Archbishop very graciously conceded the point; the Bishop of London offered very slight opposition, and altogether to-day acted nicely. It was resolved also that this particular Report should be communicated to the Colonial Bishoprics Council.[1]

"The only subject fully debated in the afternoon was the Bill to be introduced into the Imperial Parliament, with reference to the position of Colonial Clergy and the property of the Church. All the conclusions arrived at by the Committee were assented to, and a Sub-committee appointed to see to the drafting of a Bill, and submitting it to the Government. Little more remained to be done. The Primus of Scotland moved, and I seconded, a Resolution asking the President to express to the Russian Church the sympathy of the Anglican Communion with it, under the loss it had sustained by the death of its eminent Metropolitan Philarete. I would have done more with reference to the subject of intercommunion with the Greek Orthodox Church, but other Bishops thought more could not now be done. The Bishop of Graham's Town and his assistant secretaries were heartily and unanimously thanked for the important services which they had rendered in preparing matter for the Committees; and the Archbishop was once more warmly thanked for summoning the Conference, and his conduct of it. And then this most important gathering, whose conclusions are destined

[1] These Reports were officially published under the title "Meeting of Adjourned Conference of Bishops of the Anglican Communion." (Rivingtons.)

to exercise so great an influence on the whole future of the Churches of our Communion, both at home and abroad, came to a close, the Archbishop giving the final blessing."

Interesting as are all the Reports which went forth as the result of this Synod, and important as regards the whole Colonial Church, and therein to the South African Church, we can only find room here to insert that one which most especially concerns the subject of these memoirs, *i.e.* the

"Report of the Committee appointed under Resolution VI. of the Lambeth Conference.[1]

"By the Resolution of the Lambeth Conference, two questions were referred to the Committee:—

"I. How the Church may be delivered from a continuance of the scandal now existing in Natal?

"II. How the true Faith may be maintained?

"I. On the first question, the Committee recommend that an address be made to the Colonial Bishoprics Council, calling their attention to the fact that they are paying an annual stipend to a Bishop lying under the imputation of heretical teaching, and praying them to take the best legal opinion as to there being any, and, if so, what, mode of laying these allegations before some competent Court; and if any mode be pointed out, then to proceed accordingly for the removal of this scandal.

"The Committee also recommend that the address to the Colonial Bishoprics Council be prefaced with the following statement:—

"'That whilst we accept the spiritual validity of the sentence of deposition pronounced by the Metropolitan and Bishops of the South African Church upon Dr. Colenso, we consider it of

[1] The Resolution was, "That, in the judgment of the Bishops now assembled, the whole Anglican Communion is deeply injured by the present condition of the Church in Natal; and that a Committee be now appointed at this general meeting to report on the best mode in which the Church may be delivered from a continuance of this scandal, and the true Faith maintained. That such Report shall be forwarded to his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, with the request that he will be pleased to transmit the same to all the Bishops of the Anglican Communion, and to ask their judgment thereon."

the utmost moment, for removing the existing scandal from the English Communion, that there should be pronounced by some competent English Court such a legal sentence on the errors of the said Dr. Colenso as would warrant the Colonial Bishoprics Council in ceasing to pay his stipend, and would justify an appeal to the Crown to cancel his letters patent.'

"II. On the second question: 'How the true Faith may be maintained in Natal?' the Committee submit the following report:—

"'That they did not consider themselves instructed by the Conference, and therefore did not consider themselves competent, to inquire into the whole case; but that their conclusions are based upon the following facts:

"'1. That in the year 1863, *forty-one* Bishops concurred in an address to Bishop Colenso urging him to resign his Bishopric.

"'2. That in the year 1863, some of the publications of Dr. Colenso—viz. *The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua Critically Examined, Parts I. and II.*—were condemned by the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury.

"'3. That the Bishop of Cape Town, by virtue of his letters patent as Metropolitan, might have visited Dr. Colenso with summary jurisdiction, and might have taken out of his hands the management of the Diocese of Natal.

"'4. That the Bishop of Cape Town, instead of proceeding summarily, instituted judicial proceedings, having reason to believe himself to be competent to do so.

"'That he summoned Dr. Colenso before himself and Suffragans.

"'That Dr. Colenso appeared by his proctor.

"'That his defence was heard, and judged to be insufficient to purge him from the heresy.

"'That, after sentence was pronounced, Dr. Colenso was offered an appeal to the Archbishop of Canterbury, as provided in the Metropolitan's letters patent.

"'5. That this act of the African Church was approved—

"'By the Convocation of Canterbury.

"'By the Convocation of York.

"'By the General Convention of the Episcopal Church in the United States in 1865.

"'By the Episcopal Synod of the Church in Scotland.

"'By the Provincial Synod of the Church in Canada in 1865.

"'And, finally, the spiritual validity of the sentence of deposition was accepted by *fifty-six* Bishops on the occasion of the Lambeth Conference.'

"Judging, therefore, that the See is spiritually vacant, and learning by the evidence brought before them that there are many members of the Church who are unable to accept the ministrations of Dr. Colenso, the Committee deem it to be the duty of the Metropolitan and other Bishops of South Africa to proceed, upon the election of the Clergy and Laity in Natal, to consecrate one to discharge those spiritual functions of which these members of the Church are now in want.

"In forwarding their report to his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, as instructed by the resolution of the Conference, the Committee request his Grace to communicate the same to the adjourned meeting of the Conference, to be holden at Lambeth on the 10th day of the present month.

"G. A. NEW ZEALAND, *Convener*."

The Bishop of Cape Town continued his persevering efforts to find a fitting Bishop for Natal—an undertaking the difficulty of which became only too apparent. What was there to induce any man to leave home and friends, and everything precious to him—body and mind—for that unhappy, distraught, wellnigh despairing country, save indeed the consciousness of throwing himself into the breach for the sake of his Lord and the Faith? And how natural it was that one good man after another should mistrust his own capacity for the fearfully difficult and responsible post; or doubt whether he was called by God to it!

The Bishop's Journals are full of his attempts[1] and disap-

[1] "I need not say that I am in active correspondence about men," he wrote (December 2nd, 1867) to Archdeacon Thomas. "I have heard of thirty, but the

pointments; he and his brother Bishops, English and Colonial, working together indefatigably. Meanwhile he was not idle in other respects.

"*December* 11*th*, Colonial Church Council Committee. Subjects, appointment to the See of Gibraltar, foundation of the South American See at the Falkland Islands, discussion as to legal proceedings *in re* Natal. Agreed that there should be a day fixed for the discussion of this, but that I should first wait to see the course pursued with regard to legal proceedings in Natal.

"13*th*, Letter from Hamilton declining Natal. Meeting at Freemasons' Hall of members of E. C. U., they having intimated through their president a desire to help forward the endowment fund for a Bishop in Natal. About 200 members present. . . . S. Alban's Guild brought a subscription list to the extent of £40 for five years.

"14*th*, South African Bishops met to discuss Bishop Tozer's proposition about separating his Mission from the Province of South Africa, and annexing it to the See of Canterbury, and also to consider who next to be invited to go out to Natal. Agreed that I should write to the Archbishop to request his Grace, if a vacancy should occur in the Central African See, to consecrate, without waiting for communication from Cape Town. Did not agree to separate at present that Mission from the South African Province, chiefly because the Church of England has as yet made no provision for regulating unattached Missionary Dioceses, and had established no system for the trial of a Missionary Bishop. Agreed to inquire more fully about the

misfortune is that for this very delicate and trying post almost every gift and grace are required, and the men who are fit for it have either found their work or are too young. . . . I doubt whether I shall be able before this mail leaves to say Eureka!" Among the priests proposed was the Rev. A. R. Ashwell, now Canon of Chichester, and Principal of the Theological College there, of whom the Metropolitan writes to Bishop Wilberforce, "There is no doubt about his ability and soundness." And again he writes to the same: "My experience makes me feel very strongly that men are looking for *calls*. Our system has been that they shall be *candidates*. . . . Several men would have gone to Independent Kaffraria, if *called*."

Rev. W. K. Macrorie for the See of Natal,[1] and agreed also upon a list to be invited in succession. Left in the afternoon for Warminster.

"15*th*, Preached morning in the parish church: afternoon in a new church by Street.

"16*th*, Inspected the Mission Institution. Meeting, then large party of parishioners. Not a moment's quiet the whole day.

"17*th*, Wantage. Long talk with Butler about men. Barff, strongly recommended by Bishop of Oxford, and H. Barter, strongly recommended by Butler, came over to see me. Barter is very nice, but too young to be put over —— and ——. He told me that he felt so much that he would go out if called (as I thought) to any post. I liked very much all I saw of Barff. . . . Very large meeting in the evening, and parishioners in afterwards till midnight."

Thence the Bishop went (after an early celebration in the Home) on the 18th to the Rev. Sir George Prevost at Stinchcombe, and after a service and meeting at Dursley he mentions having "walked back with old Mr. Davis, aged eighty-two, called the George Herbert of the Forest, a very good old man full of life and wisdom." Both here and at Gloucester good men were mentioned to the Bishop for Natal. At the latter place he visited the Sisterhood of S. Lucy and its Children's Hospital with great interest, saying Nones in the Chapel, preaching both at S. Mark's and S. Aldate's, and going on to Highnam Court, where on S. Thomas's Day he attended the services in "the beautiful church built by Mr. Gambier Parry, perhaps the most highly decorated church in England. He himself has painted the chancel, etc.; he finished the roof of Ely Cathedral, has just finished a chapel in Gloucester Cathedral, and has built the Home and Hospital."

"It requires some effort to keep up," the Bishop writes December 22nd, "preaching on one subject unceasingly." Nevertheless he went on, now to Taunton, where, as in so

[1] "I have written to Macrorie, even the Bishop of London approving of him." —*Letter to the Bishop of Oxford*, December 23rd, 1867.

many places, he was met with an address of thanks for his defence of the Faith. Bournemouth followed, where he preached on Christmas morning in the parish church, one which the Bishop always specially admired, and in which he frequently expressed his delight. Hastening to London with the intention of meeting Mr. Macrorie (who, among the six or seven men now proposed for Natal, was first), he and Mrs. Gray found so dense a fog that they could scarce get to Norfolk Square; but Mr. Macrorie had been delayed, and they did not meet until the 28th, when, together with the Bishop of Graham's Town, they had a long conference. Going on the 29th to preach at Tottenham, the Bishop was struck by the number of large dissenting chapels which he passed on the way. "Our system is radically defective," he remarks, pondering over this, "through overgrown Dioceses. Theoretically we have the most perfect system—Bishops, Archdeacons, Rectors, Parishes, Synods,—but all are fast becoming mere names."

The year 1867 was ended at S. Leonard's, where the Bishop and Mrs. Gray were Mr. Vaughan's guests; and after services and a meeting, they returned late at night in intense cold to London, and on the Circumcision 1868, the Bishop preached at Ealing. On January 4th Mr. Macrorie's[1] decision to accept the Bishopric in Natal was received; and now began a series of fresh annoyances and difficulties as to the place of consecration, involving days of harassing toil and many a sleepless night for him on whom thus fell the care of his poor African Churches. He was continually moving, too, from one place to another, for services and meetings, involving occasional delay in receiving his letters,—*e.g.* "*January 8th*, All early morning spent in hunting over Oxford for my bag of documents, which was not taken out of the fly last night. Heard that yesterday's letters, probably including letters from the Archbishop, Macrorie, and others of great importance, were mis-

[1] The Rev. W. K. Macrorie had been a Master at Radley, after which he held the living of Wapping, and at the time of his appointment to the Bishopric he was incumbent of Accrington in Lancashire. "You see I have my Bishop," the Metropolitan wrote (January 16th). "Everybody—Moberly, Burgon, etc.—that I meet with who knows him, speaks most highly of him."

sent. Cannot now write definitely about the consecration of a Bishop by this mail to Natal or the Cape, or make a single step in making arrangements. Knocked up with anxiety.

"*January* 10*th*, Leamington; Celebration. Sermon. Letters from Macrorie finally accepting,[1] and from the Archbishop approving. Wrote to the latter for leave to consecrate in his Diocese.

"*January* 11*th*, Letter from the Primus of Scotland promising help, if need be, for the consecration in Scotland, and recommending Edinburgh. Letter from Archbishop at night, consenting to the consecration within his Province, and if desired, within his Diocese.

"*January* 13*th*, Bishop of Graham's Town to breakfast. Satisfied with Archbishop's sanction of consecration in his Province and Diocese. Wrote to African Bishops for formal confirmation of the election. At 10 to Windsor. Called on Carter at Clewer, and at the Home upon Mrs. Monsell, about Sisters. Marvellous are the works which Carter has erected—the Home, Orphanage, Convalescent Hospital; now a new building close to Windsor, and a new church.[2] The Sisterhood is spreading all over England. I told him that he was becoming the General of an Order; and he admitted it. Went to the Courtenays in the Cloisters. Windsor Castle to luncheon. View of Eton Chapel and the reaches of the river very fine.

"*January* 14*th*, Cuddesden. The Bishop of Oxford wrote to the Dean of Canterbury about the Cathedral, I to Bailey about the consecration at St. Augustine's. Invited Bishops of Montreal, Nova Scotia, Christ Church, and Tennessee, to assist. Prepared the formal deed for the consecration in concert with S. Oxon and Woodford.[3]

"*January* 15*th*, Finished the consecration document with the Clergy now gathered. Burgon offers S. Mary's, and eager to help. Rode with S. Oxon to Newnham. Much confidential

[1] Since Mr. Macrorie's acceptance on the 4th, his family had urged him to reconsider the step, and although he had not retracted, some doubt had been left on Bishop Gray's mind as to whether, after all, he might go.

[2] St. Stephen's Mission Church, Clewer. [3] Now Bishop of Ely.

talk with him about questions under consideration relating to the Church." Bishop Gray next visited Hungerford, Newbury, and Hambleden, where, on January 20th, he received "anxious letters about the consecration. Primus of Scotland writes that the Bishop of London has sent a long and grave letter, of so weighty a character, remonstrating against our consecrating in Scotland, that he has summoned a Synod of Bishops for the 23rd, to consider the question, and urging a postponement. Violent articles in the *Times, Spectator,* and *Pall Mall* and a furious letter from 'an enraged Priest.' Verily Satan sees his kingdom shaken!

"*January* 21*st,* Wrote to Burgon, to accept his offer of S. Mary's for the consecration; to Bishop of Oxford to say that I see no other course open. Evidently the enemies of the truth and of the freedom of the Church are on the alert."

Difficulties and hindrances were thickening. On January 13th, 1868, the Metropolitan wrote to the *Guardian,* to satisfy the general desire to know that a Bishop for Natal had been found:—

"Sir—There are many who will rejoice to hear that one has at length been elected to the office of Bishop of the Church in Natal. The appointment has been made by the Metropolitan and the Bishop of Graham's Town, in concurrence with the Archbishop of Canterbury, in accordance with the following resolution" [here the resolution passed at Pieter Maritzburg, October 25, 1866, is given]. "The person chosen for this difficult post is the Rev. W. K. Macrorie, M.A., of Brazennose College, Oxford, formerly a Master of Radley College, afterwards Incumbent of Wapping, and since presented to the living of S. James', Accrington, by the Hulme Trustees. The place and time for the consecration have not yet been definitely fixed.

"I avail myself of this opportunity to state what has been done towards making a provision for the new Bishop until the endowment shall revert to the Church. A committee has been formed for the purpose of raising the required income. The Rev. and Hon. H. Douglas, Hanbury, Bromsgrove, and the Rev. Canon Seymour, Kinwarton, Alcester, have kindly consented to

act as secretaries. It has, however, almost of necessity, fallen upon me to guarantee an income. I have promised that £600 a year shall be forthcoming so long as it may be needed, and that the expenses of passage, etc., shall be paid.

"The committee has received promises of subscriptions amounting to about £700 a year for five years, and nearly £1000 has been given in donations. The subscriptions, owing to deaths, removals, and other accidental circumstances, can hardly be estimated as producing £600 a year for five years. At the expiration of that term we may, therefore, be placed in very difficult circumstances, if a better provision be not made. I am sure that Churchmen would not wish this responsibility to remain with me. What we most need at this time is a guarantee fund in case of its being required. Some have suggested that an annuity should be purchased for the period of Dr. Colenso's life. I should be thankful if this could be done, as it would relieve all parties from anxiety."

The result of this was that on January 22nd the Bishop of Cape Town received a letter in Norfolk Square from the Bishop of London, which was in the *Times*, together with a leader to back it up before the Metropolitan received it. He was going to Hereford for a confirmation, but feeling the importance of meeting this attack from so high a quarter in the best way, the Bishop telegraphed to put off his engagement at Hereford, and went at once to Cuddesden to consult the Bishop of Oxford, who, meanwhile, was on his way to London! The Metropolitan went to Oxford, where he found most of his friends absent; and while consulting with Mr. Bright, a telegram came from the Bishop of Oxford urging him to come at once to London, which he was just able to do by the last train, and reach Norfolk Square too late to do anything that night, except to find that the Bishop of Oxford and Graham's Town had been telegraphing for him in every direction.

The next morning (January 23rd) the Metropolitan, the Bishops of Salisbury, Graham's Town, and Free State, and Mr. Macrorie, met at the Bishop of Oxford's at breakfast, and discussed the whole matter, after which the Metropolitan wrote a

private, and also an official letter, signed by the other African Bishops, to the Archbishop on the subject of the consecration. Sir Roundell Palmer had expressed his opinion "that Colonial Bishops' consecration in England would be a violation of the Act of Uniformity." The Bishops took their letter to the Archbishop themselves, "saying we meant to apply to the Scotch Bishops, and had a right to ask his strong support. He concurred, and said that he would send an official reply as speedily as possible; was then going to the Ecclesiastical Commission, and from thence to the Ritual Commission. Telegraphed to Scotch Bishops asking leave, as their Synod was to meet to-day. Wrote letters in every direction, announcing that the consecration would not take place on Saturday,[1] and to most of the Scotch Bishops. Telegram in reply from the Primus asking further information as to election,—legal hindrances,—reasons why we should not consecrate in Africa. Got my reply off by 9 P.M.

"*January* 24*th*, Breakfast at S. Oxon's—Bishops of Graham's Town and Free State and Macrorie there. Received letters from Bishops of Edinburgh and Brechin speaking of their great difficulties, evidently intended to lead me to withdraw my application, but saying that, if necessary, the Scotch Bishops would, they trusted, do their duty. The Bishop of Oxford concurred with me in not withdrawing my application. Read my reply to the Bishop of London to the Bishops—they all approved of it, and S. Oxon helped me to improve it. Back home to see if there was any letter from the Archbishop, and down again to meet Bishop of Oxford. Long talk with Sir R. Phillimore about legal proceedings. He strongly dissuades proceeding in Queen's Bench by *scire facias*. Thinks the Trustees might, when Colenso's new book comes out, take proceedings on the score of being compelled to pay heresy. Very tired with labour of body and mind, and much anxiety. Late in the evening a messenger left a letter at my door from the Archbishop of York, remonstrating as to the consecration.

[1] It had been proposed to consecrate the new Bishop on S. Paul's Day (January 25th), 1868.

"*January 25th,* The Archbishop of York's letter appeared in the *Times* this morning, with an article in support of it. Very meanly and uncourteously do these great Prelates treat a brother in thus sending their agitating letters to the public press before they send them to him! This morning came a public, and also a private letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury. He wishes to publish the reply to our letter to him, but not our letter itself, as it would show his vacillation! I wrote to tell him I could not be the medium of so doing . . . and quoted my correspondence with his Grace, showing how he had changed his mind. Wrote also a private letter to the Archbishop of York, rebuking him for his want of courtesy, and telling him that I would reply publicly." The whole of this correspondence was published at the time, and will be found in an accompanying volume containing Bishop Gray's printed letters and Charge. It is therefore unnecessary to quote more of it here than is required for historical purposes. The Metropolitan's reply to the Bishop of London is grave and dignified. He states—

"I. That I think there has been nothing in our past conduct which would warrant your assuming that we should proceed to consecrate without that assent of the Metropolitan and Bishop of the Diocese which alone would make it canonical. Most certainly we contemplated no such step.

"II. That throughout all these proceedings, I have been in consultation with the Primate of all England, your Lordship's Metropolitan, and have in every question yielded a glad assent to his Grace's decision.

"III. That the Church in South Africa having been declared by the highest Court of Appeal in England to be not established by law, but a voluntary association; in the same position, in no better, but in no worse, than other religious bodies; and the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury having in its resolution of June 29th, 1865, recognised its position as such; it is entitled to exercise all the rights and liberties of such an association, without interference on the part of your Lordship and others with those rights."

"IV. . . . Letters patent conveying no jurisdiction, there is no infringement of legal rights which Dr. Colenso might be held in law to possess.

"V. That as there appears to be doubt in your Lordship's mind, and the mind of others, as to the legality of the consecration in England, in consequence of the Act of Uniformity, which ordered the Queen's mandate to be inquired for, it has been thought right to avoid all possible infringement of the law, and that the consecration should not take place where the Act of Uniformity is in force.

"VI. That, inasmuch as it is highly inconvenient, and almost impossible, that it could take place at this time in Africa, in consequence of my own necessary presence in England, and other substantial reasons, we sought and should have obtained, as I have reason to believe, from the Primus, the permission of the Bishops of the Church in Scotland for the consecration to take place there, had not his Grace, the Archbishop of Canterbury, counselled, at the last moment, delay.

"VII. That we had no *locus standi*, as the Bishops of what the law has declared to be a mere voluntary association, for making such an application as you charge us with having wrongfully omitted, to the officers of the Crown, as to the legality of such Bishop's consecration in England without the mandate; but that we have, for our own satisfaction and guidance, sought privately the opinion of eminent lawyers;—and that, though they do not altogether agree in view, it has been decided, in consequence of their opinion, that the consecration should not take place in England or Ireland, where only it could possibly be held to be illegal.

"VIII. I should not have felt myself at liberty to state publicly what passed at the recent Conference of the Bishops of the Anglican Communion; but as you have done so, and appeal to me for the accuracy of your report, I am constrained to say that I cannot concur in your statement. The facts were these: The great majority of Bishops at the Conference were eager to adopt a Resolution accepting the spiritual sentence by which Dr. Colenso was deposed. The President, being appealed to by the

Bishop of S. David's, ruled that he could not allow such a resolution to be submitted, without departing from an understanding which he had entered into with certain members of the Conference previous to its assembling. The matter was in consequence, and out of deference to his Grace, not pressed by myself to a decision. Of what the decision would have been had a division taken place, your Lordship can scarce be ignorant, inasmuch as it has been publicly stated that (independently of his Grace and the African Bishops, whose views were already declared) fifty-five members of the Conference were so dissatisfied with the conclusion arrived at, that they signed a Declaration at the time, and in the room, affirming and accepting the spiritual sentence, and placed the same in my hands; and I am at liberty to state, that several other Bishops were prepared to add their names, if they could have done so without apparently separating themselves from the President, who was debarred from joining by the possibility of having to sit in the highest Court of Appeal in judgment on the question."

"IX. Refutes a mis-statement as to the Report upon Natal already entered upon.

"X. You say, as you have frequently said before, that you believe Dr. Colenso's teaching to be 'dangerous;' that his See is not vacant; and that you believe that he can be and ought to be 'legally deposed.' In common with nearly the whole Episcopate of the Anglican Communion, I hold that, although he retains the title of Bishop of Natal by the Queen's letters patent (as the late Duke of York, though no Bishop, had the title of Bishop of Osnaburgh), he has been canonically deposed from his spiritual office. I could not therefore adopt any proceedings with a view to do what I hold to be already done, even if I believed that there was any Court in England which has by law a right to try and depose him, which I do not. It would be uncanonical and unprecedented for a Metropolitan, under any circumstances, to apply to a purely secular Court to depose one of his Suffragans. In this case I have throughout acted as judge, and not as accuser; and I do not think it consistent with my duty to ignore the functions of my office.

With your views, however, I cannot understand why you have not taken legal proceedings. You were urged to do so five years ago, at our Conference on the subject. You then strenuously affirmed that it was my duty to proceed in my own Metropolitan Court. I have done all that could be required of me; but inasmuch as all Dr. Colenso's heretical writings have been published in your Lordship's Diocese, and within your jurisdiction, it would seem that if proceedings can be taken to deprive him of his letters patent, the duty of moving in the matter rests upon your Lordship far more than upon any other Bishop of the Church.

"XI. I do not see any force in your objection drawn from the words of the Consecration Service,[1] provided that there be no illegality in the act of Convocation — the only sense in which they can be used by any voluntary society being that there is nothing in the act which those who use the words are doing which is contrary to the laws of the realm. The Rubric, which requires the consecrating Bishop to demand the Queen's Mandate is, and only can be fulfilled, where no Mandate can issue, by the statement of that fact in answer to the question. This must be the case for the future, after the decision of successive Governments to issue no more Mandates wherever the Church is not established in the Colonies.

"XII. Your Lordship is pleased to intimate that the consecration of a Bishop would create a 'schism for which there is no precedent from the days of the non-jurors.' There is no parallel between the two cases. Ever since the return of the deposed Bishop, he has been at the head of a schism. On your argument, the Bishop who is in separation from us must be in the position of the non-jurors, as we are, beyond question, the ancient church who have separated him from our Communion, because we dare not recognise in him a teacher come from God, bearing a commission from Christ our Lord to rule His Church and feed the souls of His people. Since that teacher's

[1] *i.e.*, "that the Bishop-elect is called upon to declare that he is persuaded that he is truly called to the office 'according to the order of this realm.'" *See* Bishop of London's Letter.

return, your Lordship has officially (if my memory does not betray me) addressed him, I hope inadvertently, as your 'Dear Lord,' 'your faithful brother in Christ;' and he has taken good care to give publicity to your letter.

"You have asked me, in the name of the Church of England, a question, to which in this letter I give my answer. In return, I venture, in the name of the same Church, and in my own as Metropolitan of a Province which you have deeply and grievously wounded by your whole course of proceedings in this matter, as I have shown in my published 'Statement,' to ask you whether you do hold communion with Dr. Colenso or not? Whether you regard him as the representative Bishop of the Church of England in Natal or not? Whether he is entitled, in his character of teacher, to speak in the name of their great and ancient Church or not? Vague phrases about disapproving of his teaching evade the question, and do not meet the necessities of this crisis. The issue at stake is simply this:—Have we received a Revelation from God, of which the Scriptures are a written and infallible record? or have we not received any such revelation? Is Christianity, as it has been delivered to us from the first, true, or is it a lie? Are we to exchange it for a new religion or not? Nothing less than these are the questions raised by Dr. Colenso's writings. We must take our sides on these great questions,—we cannot be neutrals." . . .

To the Archbishop of York's letter the Metropolitan replied that "from the first having opened our whole case to the Church at home, and being in full communication with the Archbishop of Canterbury, he knew of no reason why he should have made any special communication to the Archbishop of York."

In reply to Archbishop Thomson's desire for delay in order to ascertain whether the Bishop of Natal was rightly and canonically deprived, and whether the consecration can lawfully take place, the Metropolitan not unnaturally observes that if these questions trouble his Grace, it seems strange that he should not have endeavoured to satisfy his mind during the last four years, but have reserved them till the last moment, when their intru-

sion might obstruct the consecration, and he refers his Grace to the proceedings which had been before the Church and the world for all that time.

"Your Grace," the Metropolitan says farther on, "has most justly observed that any false step taken on the present occasion might inflict a wound 'on the Church of England from which it might suffer for many generations.' I myself go farther than you do in my apprehensions. All Churches have their seasons of trial, when they are weighed in the balances. A time of trial has come upon the Church of England. She has to decide whether she will hold communion with one of whom her gravest Synod has declared that his writings 'involve errors of the greatest and most dangerous character, subversive of faith in the Bible as the Word of God;' and whose deposition the great majority of the Bishops of our Communion have recognised, or with the Orthodox Church in South Africa, which has separated that teacher from her communion, and has deposed him from his office. She cannot hold communion with both; so strange an attempt would only expose her to the scoffs and derision of Christendom.

"Would your Grace allow of such a compromise with heresy in your own Province or Diocese? Would you suffer one holding your commission to publish to the world open contradictions to the Faith of Christendom, and permit the powers of your high office to slumber over his delinquencies?

"The Church in Natal has been weakened, and Dr. Colenso's moral position greatly strengthened, by the substantial support which has been given to him by some English Bishops during the last two years, and which is now being practically given by your Grace. . . . Your Grace, I am fully persuaded, rejects these blasphemies for yourself; but that is not the point at issue. The question forced upon you at this time is, Whether as Primate of one of the Provinces of the Church of England you do now recognise, or are prepared to recognise hereafter, should a civil court require you to do so, this false teacher as a true pastor of the Church with whom you are in communion? You cannot escape from a decision on this point. Sooner or

later it will be forced upon you, and upon your Province; and the very existence of that Province, as a portion of the Church of Christ depends upon the answer that it gives. Had your Grace been present at the late great Conference, you would have seen how, with one or two rare exceptions, that whole body felt that the maintenance of the Faith and the witnessing truly to Christ was the first great duty of every portion of the Church. I trust that the Bishops of my own loved Mother Church will not betray their Lord in this hour of trial. If they do, I am persuaded that the days of the Church of England are numbered. If I read aright the messages of our Ascended Lord to the Angels of the Churches, they cannot allow the courts and powers of the world to interfere between them and their duty to that Lord, without an entire forfeiture of His Presence and favour, and of their own standing as living branches of His Church and Kingdom. Your Grace will permit me to say that the course which you seem prepared to adopt at this crisis fills me with anxiety and alarm."

The Bishop was engaged at Exeter on the Sunday, January 26th, to preach at S. David's, S. Leonard's, and S. Sidwell's,[1] and he fulfilled his promises, weary and worn as he was.

"I feel just now," he wrote (January 27th), "as S. Paul may have felt when he had to fight with beasts at Ephesus, 'cast down but not destroyed.' Verily without are fightings, within are fears, but no doubts, thank God, as to what our duty to Christ and His Church requires us to do." A letter from the Coadjutor Bishop of Edinburgh, almost supplicating me to release the Scotch Bishops from their position, but saying that if they must do their duty, he thinks they probably will. Replied to him that no step would more strengthen his Church

[1] The Metropolitan on his arrival was shown a correspondence between the Bishop of Exeter and some of his Clergy—the aged Bishop (then in his ninetieth year) having been over-persuaded by certain persons who wished to annoy the Metropolitan, that he was in a position of antagonism to the Church, and that the Bishop of Exeter ought to inhibit him. One would gladly pass over this episode out of respect to Bishop Phillpott's memory, but in so doing one might be supposed to have a different object in silence. Suffice it to say that he altogether withdrew an act which would indeed have been in glaring contradiction to the whole of his past career.

than doing its duty at such a crisis to God and the whole Church. Meeting full and respectable. Archdeacon Freeman took the chair, and made an admirable speech vindicating the deposition of Dr. Colenso, and the course pursued by me. Archdeacon Woolcombe also present. Very hearty.

"*January* 28*th*, Letters private and public this morning from the Primate, counselling the abandonment of the consecration, on the ground that he feared that some of the English Bishops would not recognise the deposition or the new Bishop. I have now no option. The responsibility for the present is shifted from me to the Church of England. It is my duty to let the Scotch Bishops know at once that the Archbishop has changed his mind at the last moment. Wrote to all these, and the African Bishops. Telegraphed to S. Oxon for an interview in London, offering to go up to-morrow, breaking away from a meeting. Hearty letter from the Primus, telling me that he had a Church ready for me, and offering hospitality to us all. . . . Left Exeter at 1.30, having received every kindness from our dear old friends.

The Archbishop's public letter is printed in the correspondence already alluded to. Its somewhat timid utterances close with a paragraph clearly showing that the Primate's private opinion remained unaltered.

"With reference to the proposed consecration of Mr. Macrorie, while, as I have already intimated, I must withhold my consent to its being performed in my Diocese or Province, I still adhere to the opinion expressed in the letter addressed by the Bishop of Oxford and myself to Mr. Butler, that there is nothing in Dr. Colenso's legal position to prevent the election of a Bishop to preside over them, by those of our Communion in South Africa who, *with myself*, hold him to have been canonically deposed from his spiritual office."

The Metropolitan hurried from Ilminster, having just left Shepton Beauchamp, where he had gone at the request of the Rev. S. S. Coles, who asked him to come early, his people being unable to attend at night; and the Bishop's comment in his Journal is: "Service at 10. Crowded with farmers and

labourers. I have not been struck with anything in England more than this—the way in which a congregation came together on a week-day. What a testimony to the Priest's work and influence!"

Reaching town that night, he sought the Bishop of Oxford at eight the next morning. "He was not up when I arrived, and no breakfast on the table. He took me to Lord Beauchamp's, where a caucus of the Ritual Commission — Hubbard, Phillimore, Dean of Ely, Hope, Perry — met to discuss their day's work. However, they made me open out, and read the Archbishop's letter. Then drove with S. Oxon to Richmond's, to whom he was sitting for his portrait; there revised with him my three replies to the two Archbishops and Bishop of London, and discussed the Bishop of Exeter's matter. Went to S. P. G. about Madagascar Mission, and in the late afternoon went to Salisbury."

Before leaving London, the Metropolitan's reply to the Archbishop of Canterbury was sent.

"21 Norfolk Square, January 30th, 1868.

"My Lord Archbishop—I submit my proceedings as to the consecration of an orthodox Bishop for Natal at this time, whether in England or Scotland, to your Grace's judgment, feeling that I ought not, in this country, to act without the hearty consent and support of the Primate of all England. So long as your Grace had no objection to offer to our consecrating within your Province or Diocese, or in Scotland, I was prepared to proceed without hesitation with the consecration. But as your Grace, upon fuller information, deems it to be the course of Christian wisdom to postpone the act, I acquiesce. Your Grace, I am fully persuaded, feels the gravity of the present crisis. The opposition of those Bishops to whose objections your Grace has thought it right to yield, seems to me to remove the responsibility of delaying this consecration from the South African to the Home Episcopate. Upon the course which the Bishops of the Mother Church shall now take must depend the unity of the Church of England herself, and her

own standing in Christ's Kingdom. It is that Church which is now really on its trial at the bar of Christendom. Her greatest Synod has declared that Dr. Colenso's teaching contains 'errors of the greatest and most dangerous character, subversive of faith in the Bible as the Word of God.'

"At her call, and by the urgent counsel of her whole Episcopate, assembled in Westminster five years ago, he has for these errors been tried and deposed by the Bishops of South Africa, and separated from the communion of the whole Church. I do not myself understand what further action is contemplated by those Bishops who, your Grace informs me, have counselled this delay, since the Convocation of Canterbury has already, in delivering its 'judgment' in this matter, ruled 'that the acceptance of a new Bishop' by the Church in Natal 'would not involve any loss of communion between it and the Mother Church; would not impair the connection or alter the relations existing between the members of the Church in the Province of Natal and the Church of England, provided the Bishop be canonically consecrated,' and certain other conditions observed. It was upon this judgment of Convocation that the South African Church has acted. The conditions have been fulfilled, the Bishop chosen and presented to your Grace, as desired, and accepted by you. The Bishop has been beforehand recognised by the Church of England's highest Synod. He has been recognised in spirit, if not in express words, by the great Anglican Conference, lately assembled in your Grace's Palace at Lambeth.

"I shall wait with trembling, in common with tens of thousands of its most devoted members, for some Synodical decision which may rescue the Church of England from the false position in which some of its Bishops have placed it. Should no further action be taken, it would, I fear, leave the Church of England burdened with the alliance of heresy, by the endurance of the deposed heretic as a Bishop in Communion with itself. Whatever the decision of the Bishops of the Church of England may be, the duty of the Church in South Africa is clear. It is bound, if it can, to provide a faithful pastor for the souls of the people intrusted to its care; and, God helping,

I trust, on my return to my Province, with the aid of my Comprovincials, to be able to consecrate there. We hold that the maintenance of the Faith is the first and highest duty of every Church; that that duty must be preferred before any other consideration; and that nothing can release us from the obligation to discharge that duty at the present crisis.—I remain, my dear Lord Archbishop, your Grace's faithful and obedient servant, R. CAPETOWN."

Bishop Gray returned to town, February 1st, and preached at S. Mary Magdalene, Paddington, and S. Saviour's, Highbury, on the Feast of the Purification. His Journal records a continued pressure of work:—

"*February 3rd,* Finishing off correspondence. Wrote a long letter to the Bishop of Ripon in reply to one published by him reflecting on the course pursued by the African Bishop's letters with respect to Convocation.

"4*th,* Endless interruptions from callers. Natal and Cape letters. Consultation with the President of the E. C. U. about a case to be laid before the Attorney-General as to the legality of Consecration in England, and petitions to Convocation. To the Soho Refuge to see a Sister about going out. . . .

"5*th,* Interviews. . . . Letters to F. Grey and Dean of York for Convocation. Cape letters.

"6*th,* Farewell service at Hammersmith for Bishop of Free State. S. P .G. Madagascar Mission. Bishop of Graham's Town and Free State took leave. Agreed to important Resolutions empowering me to act in the matter of the consecration, and, if need were, the selection of another of the men whom we had agreed upon for the office of Bishop. Also as to the summoning of a Convention and Synod of Bishops. The Bishops wrote me a joint letter. . . . Went at 6 P.M. to preach at Denton's Church, in the City, for Swellendam Mission Chapel. Very tired.

"10*th,* Visited S. Peter's Home, and addressed the sisters."

On February 11th the Bishops of Graham's Town and Free State, as also the Bishop's daughter and her husband, Archdeacon and Mrs. Glover, sailed for the Cape. "Sermons, letters,

S. P. G., etc. In spite of bad cough and cold felt much refreshed by a respite from work, which has left me without a moment to myself. Still quite unable to read anything, but able to get sermons ready.

"13*th*, Sandford. Confirmation in afternoon. Service evening.

"14*th*, To Torquay.

"15*th*, Dined with the Bishop, now in his ninetieth year, very feeble and blind, but his mind still clear. He was very kind, and talked a good deal of old times. Preached at S. John's, Torquay, and after at Babbicombe, and a third time at S. Luke's, Torquay.

"18*th*, Spent the whole day in Lower House of Convocation. Discussion about Lambeth Conference and reading the Encyclical.

"19*th*, All day in Convocation—subject Colenso's trial, deposition, etc. etc. Dined at Mr. Gladstone's. Afterwards to a conversazione at the Bishop of London's to meet the members of Convocation. He and Mrs. Tait specially courteous.

"20*th*, All day again in the Lower House. Discussion still on Mr. Seymour's *gravamen*. Dean of Ely proposed an amendment, after the Dean of Westminster's and Canon Blakesley's had been almost unanimously rejected. His expressed great sympathy with me, but declined to enter into questions so full of legal difficulties. Stanley also deliberately prayed the House not to place reliance on my statements, as I was utterly unworthy of credit, and gave his reasons. . . . My name during these two days has been unceasingly before Convocation; the kindest expressions used by every one except the Dean of Westminster. I can take no notice of his imputations until they appear in the papers, and perhaps then they will not appear in full or correctly. The Dean (of Ely's) amendment, seconded by Dean of Canterbury, was rejected by forty-five to twenty-six. Canon Seymour's *gravamen* was then adopted without a division. The Lower House has now, at least, cleared that portion of the Church which it represents from all complicity with heresy."

Not to dwell at any length upon these debates, it yet seems necessary to say that on February 19th Canon Seymour (after presenting a petition from more than 500 Clergymen and laymen of the Diocese of London, and another from Worcester, praying for some authoritative statement which might clear away the anxieties raised in men's minds by the contradictory opinions which had fallen from Bishops and other eminent persons as to the heresies of the Bishop of Natal) moved the suspension of the standing orders, that his *gravamen* might be discussed with a view to making it an *articulus cleri*. The first two paragraphs of the *gravamen* recapitulate the acts of Convocation in June 1866, after which it says: "That this House, having in mind that the Church of England is in true and close communion with the Church of South Africa, of which the Bishop of Cape Town is Bishop Metropolitan, believes it to be the plain duty of this Provincial Synod to declare, on behalf of the Church of England, so far as they are competent to do so, their acceptance of these acts of the Bishops of South Africa, and that the omission of such a declaration is not only a cause of grief and perplexity to many both in and out of this House, but is also a wrong done both to the Church at home and to the Church of South Africa, and a scandal to all branches of the Anglican Communion. They therefore earnestly pray your Lordships to take measures for declaring—first, that the Church of England accepts as valid the excommunication of Dr. Colenso, and that, until he be reconciled and received into the Church by proper authority, they will, as by the 33rd of the XXXIX. Articles they are solemnly bound, hold Dr. Colenso to be 'cut off from the Church and excommunicated;' and 2ndly, That they accept the spiritual validity of the act of the Lord Bishop of Cape Town in deposing Dr. Colenso from his Bishopric."

Canon Seymour went through the whole history anew, expressing, at the conclusion of his speech, the strong feeling of many that when "we had last year a great opportunity of having the case thoroughly examined and tried by a majority of the Anglican Bishops, it was opposed by the very Bishops

who had the greatest difficulty in assenting to what was done at Cape Town. With the opportunity before them of meeting the African Bishops face to face, and submitting the question to the decision of that great Conference, they appear to have hindered this most desirable issue." Canon Seymour also spoke of the perplexity, both in England and Africa, as to how Dr. Colenso was to be received, concluding with these words:—"Nothing of late years has occurred in the Church which has caused so much pain and uneasiness. It is a scandal not only to our Church but to religion generally, and I believe it is felt to be so in those foreign churches and also those nonconforming bodies which have been alluded to to-day. If any orthodox dissenters had such a teacher among them, would their governing body hesitate to depose him from their pulpits, and put him out of their communion? I do not know how we can read our Lord's words recorded by S. Matthew in regard to how those who will not hear the Church are to be treated and avoided, and not say that one who has been so solemnly and deliberately excommunicated must be so recognised by the Church, until it shall please God to bring him to repentance and restore him to the Church."

Archdeacon Denison, Archdeacon Harris, Canon Blakesley, the Dean of Westminster, the Rev. J. W. Joyce, Dr. Fraser, Archdeacon Wordsworth, the Dean of Ely, Lord A. Harvey, Sir G. Prevost, and others spoke—Sir G. Prevost mentioning that the late Mr. Keble said that if any one wanted to see how trials were conducted in the ancient Church, he could not find a better model than the trial lately conducted by the Bishop of Cape Town.

Canon Blakesley's amendment "That, under the circumstances of the case, it is inexpedient that the *gravamen* of Canon Seymour be converted into an *articulus cleri*," was then put. Only five hands were held up for it, and it was lost by a large majority.

On the following day, February 20th, the Dean of Ely's amendment occupied the whole sitting. It was couched thus:—"That, while fully sympathising with the Lord Bishop of

Cape Town in the painful position in which he has been placed, and anxious to see the Church in Natal under the direction of an orthodox Bishop, this House is unable to adopt the *gravamen* proposed by Canon Seymour as an *articulus cleri,* because it involves questions of law upon which this House does not feel itself competent to decide." It ended in the rejection of the motion by 45 to 26—the largest division ever known in modern times. Canon Seymour's *gravamen* was then adopted as an *articulus cleri.*

To return to the Journal:—

"*February* 21*st,* Douglas came up last night. Walked down to Convocation with him. The Upper House had the Natal case before it. S. Oxon told me that he thought they would be in a minority in attempting to fulfil the request of the Lower House. Should he divide? He would do what I wished. I replied that he must judge for himself—that I could not dictate a policy for Convocation. All I could do would be to say that if I were a member I would divide; that I thought the hour had come for deciding the course of the Church of England; that if she failed to separate herself from an heretical teacher, she must abide the consequences. That I thought, we ought all to know precisely how and where we stood. He said they would first discuss the question in private, and he would then see what his strength was. That this would take some time. I therefore went down to Lambeth to consult the report of the proceedings of Conference in consequence of a letter from the Bishop of S. David's attacking my statements in the *Guardian.* Found my assertions fully borne out. When I returned to the Upper House they were just concluding their private discussion. The Bishop of Oxford said that he was in a minority of two. Read a resolution which he proposed to adopt. Asked me if I wanted any alteration. There were but ten minutes to spare. I told him that I did not like the course, but had no suggestion to offer. I then went in to hear the formal and hollow debate intended for the public. All very flattering to me, but I heard it with sickening. Had the opportunity of telling S. Asaph, Ely, Gloucester and Bristol, and Rochester,

that I thought the Bishops were ruining the Church of England. It appears that Colenso has just published a new volume of sermons, worse than those published before. The Archbishop was very warm about it, and said that he would take legal proceedings."

In the debate above alluded to, the Bishop of Oxford moved that the *gravamen* sent from the Lower House be read, and afterwards he spoke at some length upon it, saying that in his judgment it did great honour to that House, as showing their zeal in maintaining the truths of Christendom; nevertheless it was a document not easy for the Upper House to deal with. "The prayer," Bishop Wilberforce said, "is twofold, asking us to make a Synodical declaration, first, that we consider Dr. Colenso to be deposed from his Bishopric; and second, that we acknowledge and declare him to be an excommunicated man." He would deal first with the second of these prayers.

Excommunication, the Bishop said, as known to the law of England, is an act at once spiritual and temporal,—spiritual in its essence, and temporal in its inevitable accidents. An excommunicated man is not only what he would be in any voluntary society of Christians, a man cut off from certain privileges and rites of Christian communion, but is also a man subject to certain legal disqualifications. The consequence of this conjunction of temporal accidents with the spiritual sentence is, that any man being pronounced excommunicate suffers a temporal injury, and of course has a right to call upon the courts of the sovereign to remedy the wrongs which he asserts himself to have received, and to investigate the question whether he is or not—not spiritually, but according to the laws of the realm—an excommunicated man. A man cannot be pronounced excommunicate according to the laws of this land, except by a court of the realm, a court which is in itself competent to act, and is acknowledged as possessing power to enforce its decrees. The court of a voluntary society of Christians can indeed spiritually excommunicate one of their members, and so he may be deprived of spiritual communion with the body to which he belonged, and so with the whole Church; and yet he may not

be in the language of the law excommunicate, because he has not been so declared by a court which the law of this country acknowledges as having a right to pass a temporal sentence. Now the highest Court of Appeal has pronounced the court which passed the original sentence not to be a court which the law of England acknowledges, and therefore that its sentence cannot be acknowledged by law. This decision says not a word as to spiritual consequences not following the act, but it denies its legal power. While, therefore, the Upper House might believe that the man so sentenced had incurred all the spiritual consequences of excommunication, and while most, if not all the Bishops were prepared to act on this spiritual sentence in all lawful ways, yet it could not affirm the double meaning of the word; and though he (Bishop Wilberforce), and the greater part of his brethren entertained no doubt of the spiritual validity of the sentence, he thought that for these technical reasons it would be better to pass over that part of the prayer of the *articulus cleri.*

As to the deposition, while certain members of the House entertained doubts of its canonicity, the Bishop thought the House must deliberately consider and settle the doubt as a House. It would be most improper, he said, to suppose that this caution implied the slightest sympathy in any member of the House for the false teaching of the man sentenced, but there should be absolute technical certainty as to canonicity such as would satisfy every one. Therefore the Bishop proposed that a committee should be appointed to examine into it, and that the same committee should be instructed to examine Dr. Colenso's more recent works with a view to discover whether there were grounds for further proceedings, and also to address the Archbishop to take such measures as he might deem right to remove the existing scandal from the Church.

The Bishop went on to propose thanking the Lower House for their zeal, and observed that all present must agree that the character and spirit in which the Bishop of Cape Town had conducted this long struggle were marked "by the same magnanimity, which in the records of ecclesiastical history

causes the maintenance of the truth in times past by the great heroes and martyrs of the Faith to stand brightly forth, and commends their names and memories to our undying veneration."

The Bishop of London spoke more heartily than his wont with respect to the Bishop of Cape Town, saying he was sure "that he had acted throughout under a deep sense of his duty as a Christian man should," and that he admired this unselfish courage and devotedness, though disapproving of many of his individual acts. The Bishop of S. David's put in a characteristic "faint praise;" and the President put the resolution in these terms:—

"That a committee of this House be appointed to inquire into the canonicity of the deprivation referred to in the *articulus cleri*, and to examine and report on the more recent writings of Dr. Colenso. That his Grace the President be prayed to take such measures as he may see fit to remove the existing scandal from our Church. That these resolutions be submitted to the Lower House, with the expression of our thanks for the zeal they have exhibited in protesting against false teaching, and our assurance that we desire to strengthen to the uttermost the hands of the Bishop of Cape Town in his noble efforts for the maintenance of the truth of Christ. But that, in view of the canonical difficulties of the case, aggravated as we feel them to be by the announcement of the new judgment in the Supreme Court of Natal,[1] the particulars of which

[1] This alludes to the judgment given January 9th, 1868, by the Supreme Court of Natal in favour of Dr. Colenso against the Dean and the Rev. T. Walton of Pinetown, to the effect that he could take possession of all the churches and Church property in the Diocese. Dean Green wrote: "The Court has this morning given judgment and against us. We are to turn out of the Cathedral and all churches of which Dr. Colenso is trustee, and out of the Deanery. There can be no doubt it is a heavy blow. . . . The Court saw that we were resolute against acknowledging Colenso—that it was useless to try and worry us into so doing; and therefore there remained but two things, to let us turn Colenso out, or let him turn us out, and they naturally chose the latter. It is, however, a solemn thing for the churches to be thus given over to the enemies of the cross of Christ. . . . There may be an increase of infidelity and immorality. . . . Here will be a further sifting probably—new comers, strangers, and others, will go to the build-

are not yet in our hands, we think it right to postpone our decisions in the matters laid before us." This resolution was passed unanimously, and the proposed committee appointed, to be composed of the Bishops of London, Winchester, S. David's, Oxford, Llandaff, Lincoln, Norwich, Gloucester, Ely, Peterborough, Rochester, and Lichfield.

The kindly-worded expressions towards himself had no effect whatever in making Bishop Gray accept this line of action, which he felt to be an injury to the Cause of Christ and His Church. Through the next day it was weighing on his mind, while occupied with a meeting of "the old Madagascar Committee to revive the effort to raise funds for a Bishop for that island. The Bishop of Mauritius was also there. He and the Bishop of London prevented the carrying out this scheme after I left England five years ago. He is now quite convinced that the time has come for the appointment of a Bishop. Five years have, however, been lost, and he has not escaped a quarrel with the London Society, to appease which the appointment of a Bishop was abandoned. The old committee has survived, but has done nothing, even the subscriptions promised before I left England have not been collected." Bishop Gray went to Bath to preach at Bathwick and S. John's, and held a large meeting; and while there (February 23rd) he poured out his wounded feelings to perhaps the friend he loved best, and who now was the one wounding him.

"My dear Bishop—I feel that I must write to say how grievously I was pained by your speech in Convocation on Friday last, on the subject of excommunication. It distressed

ings, and not join congregations spoken against as schismatics, resisters of the law, defiers of the Queen's supremacy, and worshipping in poverty and discomfort. It adds very greatly to our trouble, not knowing whether the Mother Church may not resist our having a Bishop. . . . Of course Walton has to leave his Church, but if he puts up a large Kafir hut at his own gate, he will be able to assemble his congregation in a reverential manner." . . .

The righteous indignation felt by good men in Africa at this decision was freely poured out in correspondence public and private. It was resolved by Church people to build temporary churches at once, and that the Dean should go to England to collect funds for their succour.

me far more than the resolution, sad as I felt that to be. At the time I thought that I must have misunderstood your propositions. I have since read your speech in the *Times*, and can see no reason to hope that this was so.

"Your argument seems to me to involve an abandonment of the ground on which, as I conceived, we had been contending together for years, and a submission to the Bishop of London's position. You appear to argue that the Church of England cannot recognise the spiritual sentence excommunicating Bishop Colenso, because in England that sentence could only be pronounced by a duly constituted legal tribunal, which has not been the case with our sentence. If this be your argument, how would you deal with a Bishop excommunicated by the American or by the Scotch Church? If you say that you would accept the spiritual sentence of one unestablished body, why not of another? How can you accept the deposition, if you cannot accept the excommunication? In the eye of the English law, both must be carried out through a duly constituted legal court. You seem to admit that you would accept the deposition if canonical; why not also the excommunication?

"If the spiritual sentence in our voluntary association has been pronounced by those who have a right to pronounce it, it ought to be recognised by the whole Church. If you say to us, We in England can only excommunicate through a legal court, you have no legal court, therefore we cannot recognise your act; your argument seems untenable as an argument, and also to deny us the right of separating any from the communion of the Church.

"The real reason, I suppose, for refusing to recognise our sentence is, that it possibly might place the English Bishops in a painful position if Colenso were presented to a living, or were to bring an action for libel; but would not their position in such a case be better if the Synods of the Church had declared him to be out of communion? It would seem to me to be the greatest moral support for a Bishop to be able to say in a court of law, The whole Church has renounced communion with this man. But if not, ought this danger to prevent a Church from recognising so solemn an act as the separation of an heretical

Bishop from the communion of the faithful? And will its refusal to do so improve its position in the eyes of Christendom?

"I cannot tell you how depressed I am by this unanimous refusal of the Upper House to respond to the appeal of the Lower. It seems to me that the responsibility which it has taken upon itself is of the gravest character. I am going to write to the Archbishop to request that the committee, when they meet, will submit this question of canonicity to our most competent men; Dr. Pusey, for instance, Sir W. Palmer, Wordsworth, Joyce, Frazer, Bright, etc.; and I trust that that committee will deal with the excommunication precisely on the same principles as they do that of the deposition. I simply dread the effects of the course adopted by the Upper House. Already I have letters from others utterly shaken by the attitude assumed by the Bishops with regard to this whole case. Men whom you could little dream of are despairing of the English Church. I am quite sure that the salving over wounds which must be probed before they are healed will not do in these days. Men's minds would be far more strengthened by a bold and uncompromising course on the part of a minority, than by yielding points which weaken a position and save nothing.

"I do not want you to send any answer to this, but kindly to weigh the matter over in your mind. I feel that our position, as regards principles, which alone I care for, is worse than it has ever been, by this last act of the Upper House. It throws back the case, not hopelessly, or entirely, but nearly so, upon the decisions of courts of law.—Believe me ever, my dear Bishop, affectionately yours, R. CAPETOWN."

The letter alluded to above to Archbishop Longley was written in the railway, February 25th, on his road to Plymouth.

"Plymouth, Ash Wednesday, 1868.

"My Lord Archbishop—While I should think it unbecoming in me to offer any remarks upon the course adopted by the Upper House of Convocation with reference to the *gravamen* of the Lower House in the matter of Bishop Colenso, I may ven-

ture to submit to your Grace, with a view to prevent future complications, a few thoughts suggested by the resolution adopted by the Upper House on that subject.

"I. The Bishops of your Grace's Province have appointed a committee to consider the question of the canonicity of the spiritual deposition of Bishop Colenso. When the Lambeth Conference formed its committee for the same purpose, I urged that the question should be submitted to our most learned canonists—Sir W. Palmer, Dr. Pusey, Mr. Joyce, Archdeacon Wordsworth, Dr. Frazer, Mr. Bright, Sir R. Phillimore, and others. I feel convinced that the committee would do well, in order to command the respect and confidence of the Church, to adopt such a course now.

"II. Your Grace will not suspect me of any desire to undervalue or detract from the weight of authority which justly belongs to the decisions of the Province of Canterbury. I have throughout an Episcopate of more than twenty years shown the greatest deference to that venerable body; consulted it on every occasion that I could; and have acted upon and abided by its counsel. I may be permitted therefore to say, that if the committee appointed by it is simply instructed to consider whether, in its judgment, the sentence which I have pronounced is canonically valid, and whether, as a consequence, the Church of England is in communion with Bishop Colenso, or with the Bishops who have deposed him, and separated him from their communion, the inquiry is a perfectly legitimate one, and one which I shall rejoice to see entered into and reported upon. But if the idea prevails in the Upper House, as I rather inferred, perhaps unwarrantably, from the resolution itself, and the debate upon it, that the authoritative decision as to the canonicity of my proceedings rests with the Synod of the Province of Canterbury or with the Synods of both Provinces, I must respectfully submit that I am unable to concur in such a view. I hold that the Province of South Africa is ecclesiastically and canonically as independent of the decisions of the Convocations of York or Canterbury, as these are independent of each other; and that the vastly higher authority which

attaches to the conclusions of your Grace's Province above those of the other Provinces of our Church, arises solely from the number, weight, piety, and learning of its members.

"Holding, as I do, that whenever and wherever the Bishops of the Church are gathered together in the Name of Christ for common counsel relating to the things of God, there is in all its essential features a Synod, I should gladly have submitted, had I been permitted to do so, my whole course of proceedings in the unhappy case which has caused such scandal, and which still threatens the entire overthrow of the Church of England, to the Conference of Bishops lately assembled under your Grace's presidency at Lambeth; and have abided absolutely by its decision, as that of the highest Synod of our Communion that could be assembled. Though not allowed formally to do so, it has nevertheless practically given its verdict in this matter, and I am not prepared to submit the question again to the decision of any inferior authority. Whether in communion or out of communion with the English Church for so doing, the African Bishops hold it to be a duty which they owe to the Great Head of the Church, to consecrate a faithful pastor in the room of him whom they have deposed for heresy; and nothing, if I know myself or my brethren, will, if we are permitted to meet again in Africa, prevent our discharging this our obligation to our Lord and to His afflicted Church. May I request that your Grace will be good enough to communicate this letter to the Committee when it meets? I have the honour to remain your Grace's faithful servant in Christ, R. CAPETOWN.

"The most Reverend the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury."

The Bishop of Oxford was much troubled at the strong though loving condemnation of his line by one whom he so entirely loved and revered; for indeed their affection was no common one on both sides. Perhaps, too, he could not help feeling in his heart that he had somewhat temporised, and not held steadily to his principles. Anyhow, he wrote very regretfully to Bishop Gray, and was speedily met with a few lines of tender friendship in return.

"Plymouth, February 28th, 1868.

"My dearest Bishop—I write one line to say how deeply I am distressed to have given you so much pain: I did not mean to do so. I wished you merely to reconsider a line of argument which, if sound, I hold to be simply destructive of our whole position. Neither the sentence of deposition or of excommunication are legal. If the excommunication is not spiritually valid, because not legal, neither is the deposition, and Colenso is the true representative Bishop of the Church!

"If I have written urgently to you, and more strongly perhaps than was becoming, it was because I believed that you are the only man that can preserve the Church of England at this crisis, and that nothing short of maintaining its spiritual independence will save it. I believe there are few who hear and see more of the state of feeling among the Clergy than myself. (I suppose that full forty were present at the meeting here.) Evangelicals care little about the great truths at stake. Many others are supremacy men. But the men who constitute the marrow of the Church are more troubled, distressed, shaken, than they have ever been; and are asking what can be done. I am sure that there is a deep under-current pervading the Church, the force of which is not appreciated.

"If the legal difficulties are to prevent the Bishops of the Church of England recognising the spiritual sentence separating Dr. Colenso from the communion of the Church, that current will burst its bounds. I do not believe that there has ever been a question which has so tested the Church of England. Forgive me, my dear brother, to whom I owe so much, and whom I love very deeply. Ever affectionately yours,

"R. CAPETOWN."

Verily it was an unrestful time, and nothing save God's Grace strengthening His faithful servant could have enabled the Bishop to bear up under the struggle. A correspondence with Bishop Thirlwall, and another with Dean Stanley, were just at this same time published; but as all they contained has been repeated in other ways, it seems unnecessary to fill up these pages with

documents which one can only regret should have appeared on one side, and made answers inevitable. The Bishop of Cape Town met with a more than usually enthusiastic reception at this time, probably owing to the general sense of Churchmen that he was very distinctly persecuted for the Faith's sake. Many of the Clergy, too, were "greatly disturbed at the present state of the Church and want of vigour and courage in the Bishops." The Metropolitan went on to West Alvington, Mr. (now Archdeacon) Erle's, of whose work he wrote in high terms, regretting that he had not gone out five years before as Bishop of Independent Kaffraria, as proposed. Thence to Oxford, where he stayed with the Master of University, his old College, and enjoyed (how seldom at this time anything like *enjoyment* fell to his lot!) the society of many friends—Mr. Burgon, Bright, Medd, Bramley, Rigaut, etc.

"*March* 1*st*, Long day; preached in the morning at Holywell Church; afternoon at S. Giles', evening at S. Mary's. Dr. Pusey preached at S. Mary's at 11, and Liddon at 2. I was able to hear half of his powerful sermon. Notwithstanding the University Church was crowded to hear these the two most distinguished men in the University, we had full congregations at each service. The University Church was crowded in the evening. After all was over, I went to Queen's to hear Liddon's lecture on Holy Scripture to young men. There were about eighty present. He was on S. Paul's description of the Tabernacle service and furniture, and met critical objections as to accuracy. He was evidently tired, having preached a great sermon also on Friday."

From Oxford he wrote to Archdeacon Thomas:

"March 2nd, 1868.

"The abuse which I get in the *Times, Pall Mall, Telegraph, Spectator,* etc., acts as an advertisement! Cold hearts, prudent men, stand aloof in consequence, but others are moved and warmed, and I speak out all the plainer. . . . You will see by the papers what has been done in Convocation. I was quite satisfied with the Lower House. . . . I was not satisfied with

the Upper House, but they too will come right. . . . I suppose that I have been as severe on Bishops as most men, but I really feel for the difficulties which both beset their position, and also entangle their minds, brought up as they have been under the shadow of an Erastian Establishmentarianism. The course of events is, however, working a great change in men's minds on this point. They are losing their love for Establishments, and God is perhaps preparing the way for the changes which political events are likely to bring with them. I look with confidence to the future. . . . In every direction I see tokens of the moving of His Spirit. Go where I will, I see a deeper faith, a more determined resolve, greater zeal. It is, as Newman long since said, the chains wound round us by the world which fetter our actions. But these will be relaxed or burst. Churches must not be judged by days or years. But looking back, and comparing the past with the present, how great the change! The life of the Church of England is a wholly different thing to what it was when I first traversed this land pleading for Africa twenty years ago. Regarding our condition as somewhat similar to that of the Church in the fourth century, in its struggles with Arianism, in how many respects have we the advantage. As a whole, I believe that our Bishops are more faithful. In that day they succumbed to the State more than in our day."

"*March 2nd,* Awake the whole night from too much talking. Calls—Dr. Pusey, etc.

"3*rd,* Moved to the Provost of Oriel's. . . . Attended and spoke at wearisome length at the E. C. U. They were very hearty and uproarious in their applause.

"4*th,* Morning at the Bodleian, reading and copying MSS. of the Bishop of S. David's trial. Long talk with Dr. Pusey; pressed upon him the giving up of other works, and return to his Commentary on the Minor Prophets and Isaiah. . . . Men in Oxford are anxious about it. Westcombe told me that he had attended Dr. Pusey's lectures on Isaiah three times, and that they were always full of new matter. The Bishop of Rochester preached the Friday Lent sermon at S. Mary's.

"5*th*, Called on the Crawleys at Littlemore—breakfast with Burgon in Oriel common room. Went to London—another night almost without sleep.

"6*th*, Pamphlets and speeches *in re* Natal from Brunel, Archbishop of York, Dean of Ripon. Fear I must reply, but I have no time. Spent the afternoon in Lambeth Library—wishing to see an MS. work on Bishop of S. David's trial, containing large arguments from the Canons. Professor Stubbs, late Librarian, had been to look out the book for me, but found it was missing. Examined instead Van Espen, and *Corpus Juris Ecclesiastici.*

"*March* 7*th*, All day writing Cape letters, and preparing for a month's journey to the north, reading pamphlets *in re* Colenso, and collecting materials for a reply."

The proposed northern tour began on March 9th, and the Bishop visited (and worked hard at) Shepton (Mr. Nevill), Stoke-on-Trent, Lullington (Mr. and Lady Adelaide Law), Derby, during which days he wrote a pamphlet in reply to the published speeches alluded to above, which will be found in the accompanying volume of the Bishop's Charges, etc. He says:—"*March* 12*th*, Derby. Finished my pamphlet to-day—it is the length of three full sermons, has been written, *corrente calamo*, at spare moments, in railways, and during these four days amid sleepless nights. I have suffered for it, and I suppose *it* has also!"

Masbro', Aberford, where, owing to an engagement at Leeds being thrown up at the last moment, the Bishop had a quiet Sunday, and enjoyed the rare rest of "hearing others preach." How much though is told in the Monday's entry: "Another night of sadness. Dearest wife got up twice to read to me."[1]

[1] In proof of how, amid all the fatigue and exhaustion of this season, the Bishop never failed to do a kind thing, the following letter may be mentioned. A lady writes how, "feeling most acutely the Colenso troubles, and looking with an intensity of veneration to him whom Canon Liddon called the Athanasius of our time," having hoped for long to see some prayer for the distressed Church of Africa put forth, she at last ventured to write to the Bishop of Cape Town himself, and ask if he would tell her of one. In a few days she received a most kind reply, in

Newton Bridge, near Manchester, came next; Mr. Greenwell's. "A great ritualist, but doing as these men generally are, a real work among the people." Liverpool, where the Bishop and Mrs. Gray were Mr. Cecil Wray's guests. Thence the Metropolitan went to Accrington, and spent a few cheering hours with the Bishop-elect, Mr. Macrorie, whom he found "in good heart, and growing in confidence;" then to Manchester, Mr. (now Archdeacon) Anson; Charlton-cum-Hardy, Mr. Booth; Helmslow, Mr. Cope; Liverpool again, Warrington, Middlesbro', Stockton, Durham,[1] Chester-le-Street, Coatham, Sheffield, Wakefield, Mirfield, "where (April 3rd) we were guests of my kind friend and supporter, Mr. Wheatley Balme."

The next point was the Deanery, York. "Preached three times, twice in the Minster. There were full 3,000 people in the evening. It tried me greatly to preach. At times I think that if I do not give in I must break down; but God supports me. The Dean very hearty and kind; I hear of his good deeds on every side." On April 8th the Bishop returned to London, where the Dean of Pieter Maritzburg had now arrived, and there was, of course, much to consider and discuss. This was the Holy Week.

"*April 9th,* Discussion with Dean Green till I had to go and preach at the one o'clock service at S. Lawrence. Church

which he says—"I had hoped that I might find among my papers printed prayers drawn up by others for the afflicted Church in Africa. This, however, I have failed to do. I have, therefore, at my first leisure moment written one myself, which I should feel thankful if you will use in our behalf. I believe in the prayers of the faithful, and feel assured that we have been greatly indebted to them." The prayer is as follows:—

"O most merciful God and Father, Who hast sent Thy Son into the world to redeem it, and to gather unto Thee, in one, Thine elect from all parts of the earth; look down in pity upon Thy torn and distracted Church in Africa. Heal the divisions of Thy people: Remove from them the scourge of heresy: Restore the fallen, strengthen the hands of the upholders of Thy Truth. Fill them with wisdom and courage; with fervent zeal and love; with a spirit of self-sacrifice and devotion unto Thee, and make them instruments in Thy Hand for the founding of Thy Kingdom, the building up of Thy Church in this dark land, and of winning the heathen unto Thee. Grant this, O Father, for Thy dear Son's Sake, Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

[1] "*March 29th,* Preached to a densely crowded congregation at S. Oswald's in the evening. Service called here ritualistic, but very good."

full almost entirely of men. These services keep up in a wonderful way. Then to S. P. G., where the Standing Committee were discussing their right to interfere with special funds. Thence with Dean Green to the Bishop of Oxford, from whom I learnt that the Bishops had met and resolved on a course of action with regard to legal proceedings against Dr. Colenso, not only without communication with me, but with an express understanding that the lawyers, who were to prepare an opinion, and, perhaps, a case for them, were to have no communication with myself or Dean Green. The Dean went with me to a service at S. Lawrence at 6.30, where I confirmed about sixty —chiefly men—for the Bishop of London. Addressed them a second time, at Mr. Cowie's request, instead of a sermon.

"10*th, Good Friday,* Preached to a crowded church at S. Barnabas. In the evening to S. Paul's, where Liddon preached one of his remarkable sermons, 'I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto Me,' to a church crammed from end to end. Men say that on these occasions 7,000 can get in.

"*Easter Day,* Preached at S. Lawrence, not on Africa! Went again in the evening to hear S. Oxon, who preached in behalf of S. P. G.

"*Easter Monday,* Breakfasted at Mr. Noel's to meet the Bishop of Oxford and one or two Clergymen to discuss the question of union with the Wesleyans.

"*April* 14*th,* Left early for Lichfield with Dean Green. Read and corrected Mr. Lee's essay in *Church and the World* relating to the whole Natal case. Arrived just in time for service. Cathedral very nicely restored. Much remains to be done outside. Primus of Scotland to dinner." A visit to Mr. Francis Paget at Elford followed; and after sermons and meetings the Bishop returned to London, then went to Brighton, Norwich, and Dereham.

One trouble and anxiety arose after another. April 27th, the Bishop writes from Norwich: "Having heard from the Bishop of Graham's Town that the Duke of Buckingham had written an extraordinary despatch to Sir P. Wodehouse about the consecration of a Bishop for Natal, I wrote to his Grace

for an explanation; and if he had written such a despatch, for the grounds of it; also to Lord Carnarvon and S. Oxon, etc., on the subject."

To the latter he says: "I was sure from the Gibraltar affair,[1] that the Duke, under the guidance of ——, meant to trample upon the rights of the Church. I have written to ask—I. If there has been such a despatch? II. If so, for a copy. III. The grounds of this interference with our religious liberties. When can I see you during next week? The discussion this action must raise is of a delicate matter, and most important; and I shall need your wise and loving counsel."

The despatch in question was indeed a strange one, more especially sent, as it was, without any communication on the subject with the Metropolitan. It was dated January 30th, 1868, and definitely threw all the weight that Government and law could give into the side of heresy and schism. The impression given in Africa, as expressed by letters public and private, was that the home Government was prepared to go any lengths against the Church! This despatch was retracted and withdrawn by the Duke of Buckingham, May 23rd, 1868.

Bishop Gray could not immediately consult over this fresh embarrassment, as he was engaged to be in the Eastern Coun-

[1] "If the Duke of Buckingham refuses to issue the Mandate for the consecration of Archdeacon Harris, on the ground that he is entitled to *select* a Bishop for Gibraltar, he is urging claims which were not put forth at the time when the Colonial Bishopric Council was called into existence. Circumstances led me to know a good deal of what then was agreed upon. The Church was to recommend and select; the Crown formally to appoint. . . . The Duke of Newcastle, on the last vacancy of the See of Gibraltar, set up claims similar to those apparently advanced by the Duke of Buckingham. An appeal was, I believe, made to Mr. Gladstone as to the terms of the understanding with the Government. He confirmed the view here taken, and the Duke gave way.

"There seems to be strong reason for not issuing letters patent in the present case. There are, I believe, no Clergy in Malta and Gibraltar except military and naval chaplains. Over these the letters patent do not even affect to give the Bishop jurisdiction or control. The only other Clergy are ministers of voluntary associations outside her Majesty's dominions. Over these the Crown cannot give the Bishop any jurisdiction. The present move appears to indicate a desire to set aside the course openly adopted by Lord Carnarvon, and to re-issue letters patent, where they can only hamper and can be of no possible use."—Bishop Gray to S. Oxon, January 31, 1868.

ties for some little while longer; and accordingly he visited Diss, and went on to Colchester, Braintree, Halsted, Ipswich, Rushford College, Thetford, and S. Neot's. Mr. Wilkinson had organised the round, and it was arranged that the money collected was to be shared by Cape Town and what was already called Miss Mackenzie's Zulu Fund. The Bishop was much pleased with Mr. Wilkinson, and was speculating whether he would do for the Missionary Bishop.

"*May 2nd,* The Bishop returned to London, preached on the 3rd at S. Paul's, Knightsbridge, and S. Saviour's, S. George's Square.

"*May 4th,* To the London Society to talk over their intentions with regard to Adam Kok and Riversdale. Pleasant talk with secretaries. They gave me some interesting papers relating to their proposed changes as to their South African Missions. Thence to a law consultation relating to my appeal *in re* property in Natal. Hence to House of Commons to hear Dizzy's statement as to the course Government would pursue under their defeat about the Irish Church.

"*May 5th,* At one o'clock to Lord Carnarvon about the Duke of Buckingham's despatch. He had had a talk with Palmer. Went over much of the whole case with Lord Carnarvon, who was very kind and earnest. He proposes to ask a question of the Duke in the House, and I promised to send him all pamphlets bearing on this case. . . . Very strong, almost reproachful letter from Dr. Pusey about delay in consecration—the danger to souls and to the Church. Answered him to say there has been no delay. I had scarcely done that before Macrorie came to say he must give up, chiefly on account of his wife, but also on account of doubts as to whether the Church of England will recognise him!

"*May 6th,* Up soon after 4 A.M. Wrote to the Archbishop, telling him of my new anxieties, and asking for information as to the course which the English Bishops mean to pursue as to —I. Legal measures; II. Question of canonicity. Called at Colonial Office to see Sir F. Rogers about Natal consecration. Great meeting at S. James's Hall about Church and State. Crowds unable to get in. . .

"7*th*, To Hitchin—meeting, and preached.

"8*th*, Saw S. Oxon about the Duke of Buckingham's despatch. Back in time for discussion with Butler, Green, and Macrorie. Wrote again to the Duke, from whom I have not heard.

"9*th*, On reaching home found a reply to my first letter from the Duke, inclosing a copy of the despatch, and curtly declining to enter into the ground of it. Went off at once to Phillimore—gone to Court; next to S. Oxon, who had received a sympathising letter from the Duke on the subject, but agrees that the only course open is to move in Parliament. Went to Lord Carnarvon,—agreed to move in consultation with Lord Salisbury, Palmer, and others. On returning home wearied and worn, found a very kind note from the Duke in reply to my second letter, inviting me to come and see him before two o'clock, when he must go to a Cabinet Council. Took a cab at once, and had a long interview.[1] He knows but little of the subject. I told him my view of the matter with the utmost plainness, and of the wrong which I think the Government (the real cause of all these legal blunders) had inflicted on the Church, by doing nothing except to interfere when the Church resolved upon ridding itself of this alliance with heresy. He told me that the meaning of the despatch had been misunderstood,—that it was not meant to affect any save those who were paid by the Home Treasury and held warrants under the Crown,—that he quite agreed that we had a right to consecrate a Bishop for congregations who could not own Colenso as their Bishop,—that he would get up the whole subject by Thursday next, when he invited me to another interview. Wrote to Lord Carnarvon to advise delay."

On the 10th May, when the Bishop preached at Tooting and Beddington, and Trinity Church, Whitehall, he says: "Drove twenty-five miles to-day in different people's carriages, talking

[1] The Metropolitan wrote (May 11th, 1868) to the Bishop of Oxford: "I had a pleasant interview with the Duke, who bore with me while I spoke of our grievances and wrongs with the utmost plainness, and argued our right to have our civil liberties respected. He told me that he largely agreed with me, and admitted that we had a right to consecrate," etc.

to fresh people all the time. Dead beat at night after thirteen hours' incessant talk!" But the next day the same sort of thing began again;—meetings at Windsor, Sunningdale, and Dorking, in succession.

"*May* 14*th*, By appointment to the Duke of Buckingham to discuss the Natal case and the memorandum which I sent him in. Two of the Under-Secretaries, Mr. Adderley and Sir Frederick Rogers, were present during our discussion, which lasted an hour. The Duke was considerate and conciliatory. Sir F. Rogers took the line of guarding the Government, now that it had taken action, against doing anything that might commit itself. I maintained my ground, as taken from the beginning, and without mincing matters. The Duke seemed to feel my statement that by his course of action he had placed me in a state of collision with the Government under which I live; and that he would throw society into confusion, and cause great divisions in the Church. He came to no conclusion. I am to see him again this week. On leaving the Colonial Office went to S. P. G. Standing Committee. Found, just as I was compelled to leave, that they were about to discuss and recommend a reduction of the grant to my Diocese to the extent of £225. Went afterwards to the House of Commons. Heard Disraeli, Gladstone, Hardy, Lowe, Bright, Cardwell, etc.

"15*th*, S. P. G. Board to argue against the reduction of the grant to my Diocese to the extent of £225 a year. From thence by appointment to the Admiralty Court to see Sir R. Phillimore about the despatch. Events are fast leading many Churchmen to desire a disconnection of the Church and the State. Then to a consultation with Sir R. Palmer in the Earl Marshal's room. He spoke freely on—I. The Duke's despatch. He thought I should be neglecting my duty if I allowed such a document to exist without bringing the matter before Parliament. II. My lawsuit. Advised strongly to push the appeal; said without doubt the judgment of the Court below would be reversed. Was doubtful whether it would be wise to seek a decision on the points as to whether the original letters patent were in force in Natal. He thinks it probable that it would

be ruled that Natal was a Crown Colony,—that as such the original letters patent were good there;—that their supercession by Colenso's letters patent was also good, *if* the Crown was in the habit of legislating for Crown Colonies (which I told him I thought was the case) by letters patent and not by Orders in Council;—that it would be ruled that Natal was a *quasi* Established Church, with Colenso its legal Bishop;—that I had no legal jurisdiction, in spite of such jurisdiction being provided in the Natal letters patent, because the Court would say that it was intended by the Crown to give this jurisdiction to a Bishop of Cape Town who would have a legal jurisdiction through his own letters patent, and that not having them by such letters patent he could not have it in any other way.

"He further said that he did not advise that any legal proceedings should be taken to cancel Colenso's letters patent; that if these were taken, it could only be by *scire facias*, through one of the Chancery Courts; that probably such Court would, if the ground pleaded was false doctrine, declare that it had no jurisdiction; that possibly it would declare that Colenso's doctrine was very good! that it would be impossible to proceed by *scire facias* against me, Colenso, or Graham's Town, as holders of invalid patents; that this could only (I think) be done with the consent of the Attorney-General; that probably it would issue in the cancelling of my letters patent and Graham's Town's, and the upholding of Colenso's as good in law. He scoffed at the idea of taking proceedings by petition to the Crown, as Dr. Colenso had done—could never understand how the Privy Council had ever given the judgment they did; believed that all that body could do constitutionally was to give counsel to the Crown; that it really gave a judgment; that another attempt to get a judgment would lead to a repudiation of the right to give this; that it would be *coram non judice*. He spoke very strongly on the subject of Lord Westbury's judgments. Looked in afterwards at the House, and heard part of the debate on Lord Shaftesbury's question as to whether Government meant to legislate on the subject of ritual."

Then came another long Sunday, with sermons at Chislehurst, Hayes, and Bickley; and May 18th a rush to Chester; and the next day came an oasis at Ilam and Dovedale with Mr. and Mrs. Mackarness, where the Bishop and Mrs. Gray spent Ascension Eve in peaceful enjoyment of the lovely scenery and fine weather—the third day's holiday, as he remarks, since they came to England! Holidays, indeed, were rare events in that much-tried life. Ascension Day[1] had sermons to be preached at Ilam and Leek, but it brought a satisfactory letter from the Duke of Buckingham, saying that he proposed virtually to withdraw his despatch, though objecting to the title of the future Bishop being taken from Natal.

Bishop Gray returned to London on May 23rd, and "drove at once to the Colonial Office; discussed the despatch with the Duke till 6 P.M. Agreed upon its terms; it goes off this evening to the Cape. He told me that he was prepared to accept my suggestion about the consecration taking place in England by mandate from the Crown; that he had spoken to the Archbishop on the subject. . . . . Reached home hot, in bare time to dress for dinner at the Duke's, being the Queen's birthday."

The Metropolitan wrote to the Bishop of Graham's Town:

"May 22nd.

"My dear Bishop—The Duke virtually withdraws the despatch. He writes another to say that he sees no reason why we should not consecrate a Bishop for the congregations that cannot acknowledge Colenso. Our only remaining dispute is about the title. He wishes us to take none in Natal. I reply that the question is left for the Bishops of the Province, but that we shall probably take Maritzburg, and remind him that in doing so we shall only follow the example set us by his

[1] The Bishop was much interested in the old custom of well-dressing at Tessinden. "Drove to see the wells (May 22nd) in their dresses. They were all very beautifully dressed with flowers and appropriate inscriptions. On Ascension Day these wells are always thus dressed, and services out of the Prayer Book for the day are held at them. The custom of dressing is said to be from Danish times. All the country crowds to look at them."

Grace himself, who has issued the Queen's mandate for the consecration of Bishops in Australia, who take titles from places within letters patent Dioceses, and that if Romish Bishops in England who, in open violation of the law, assume titles—*e.g.* Archbishop of Westminster—are not molested, we may well be borne with who violate no law. He has been very kind and courteous; I infinitely plain and outspoken. I am sure we must be so in such cases. . . . He invites me see the despatch to-morrow. Outward pressure and the state of political parties have done a great deal. Lords Carnarvon and Salisbury have been most kind, also Roundell Palmer. I trust that we may consider this point settled, and that our position is strengthened by the unwarrantable interference."

"*May* 24*th*, To Egham: preached in morning in Dr. Monsell's new church; in the afternoon had something between a service and a meeting in the mission schoolroom at Staines, Mr. Furze. Preached again in the evening at Egham—very tired.

"25*th*, Back to London by 10 A.M. Went to S. Oxon, who quite agrees about the wisdom of pressing the Government for the mandate, and adopting the title of Bishop of South-east Africa, taking Natal and Zululand for the present Diocese. Went from him to Lambeth: wrote my views down for the Archbishop, who quite concurred in what the Bishop of Oxford and I had agreed upon; and promised to write at once to the Duke of Buckingham. . . . Endeavoured to stop a motion in the House of Commons on the Duke's despatch. Reached home just in time to get off by 5 o'clock for Furneaux, Spenham.

"26*th*, Ill in the night from yesterday's excitement, and the continual rush from one place to another. Wrote to the Duke of Buckingham about the mandate. Early celebration. Service at 12 o'clock, then public luncheon. Many Clergy. Service with sermon at 3. Mr. Wigram drove us to the station. Reached town at night.

"29*th*, Brighton. . . . E. C. U. meeting at 2 P.M. Preached at S. Michael's at 5. Mr. Sanderson there with a carriage to drive me to Lancing. The masters and boys were at the foot

of the hill to present me with an address. Spoke to them; all then knelt down for a blessing. Ran up to the College afterwards cheering. Got to dinner soon after 8. Chapel with an address to the boys at 9 P.M. Late to bed.

"30*th*, Confirmation at 8 A.M. Sixty candidates. Celebration, full 120 communicants. Service choral, not over till 10.30. Then breakfast, then a view of the buildings; laid a corner-stone of an arch, and off for London at 12.30."

Sermons in London, and *rushes* to Reigate, Butleigh, Williton, and Nettlecombe, ending in Oxford on June 6th, where the next day, Trinity Sunday, Bishop Gray preached the Ramsden sermon and received the fee appertaining to it, which he enters as "the first money I ever earned for myself." He preached in the evening at S. Philip and S. James, and June 8th, after calling on friends and taking turns round Christ Church Meadow and Magdalen Walks, he went over to Cuddesden, where a large party of old friends,—the Archbishop of Dublin, Deans of York and Ely, Lord R. Cavendish, and others—were gathered for the Theological College Festival of the next day. That was one of the brightest and most marked among the many gatherings with which Cuddesden is so happily associated to most of us. The Rev. H. P. Liddon preached there for the first time since he had ceased to be Vice-Principal of the college, and there was a strong feeling of cordial welcome to him, which told more or less upon every one. "Liddon preached one of his great sermons," Bishop Gray wrote; "his account of the state of Oxford and its prospects, most distressing and alarming, but borne out by all I heard from the Vice-Chancellor, Rector of Exeter, etc."

At the usual luncheon after the service, at which some 400 people were gathered in the tent, the Bishop was among the speakers most enthusiastically welcomed, and most earnestly listened to. To himself it was a day of almost incessant talk, and, though full of encouragement in the way of warmth and sympathy, most fatiguing. The next day, June 10th, the Bishop went to Beckley for the consecration of a new church built by Mr. Cooke, at which "S. Oxon preached one of his

most happy sermons, which he made as he rode along, of which nothing was written but his text on the back of a letter. . . . I preached in the evening very tired and wearied in spirit."

On S. Barnabas' Day there was a meeting in Oriel Hall, and a service at Witney; and on the 13th the Bishop returned to London, where all manner of vexations and cares still beset him;—letters from Africa concerning the "extraordinary persecutions of the Church by the Natal Government in consequence of the Duke of Buckingham's first despatch;"—"fierce letters from friends" about what seemed to them needless delay;—real delay about matters connected with the consecration, over which the Bishop had no control;—worries at S. P. G., where the African grants were being reduced;—business matters connected with the transfer of his own and Mrs. Gray's tithes for the creation of a new district at Stockton; and perhaps most trying of all to him, difference of opinion between himself and the Dean of Pieter Maritzburg concerning the course to be adopted in Natal. They went together to Hedingham Castle on the 18th, and the Bishop held a meeting in "the fine old Norman keep" there, which interested him, returning to dine at Fulham on the Accession. "Most of the Bishops present. S. Oxon told me that most of them had agreed to a satisfactory report on the canonicity of the Natal deposition; the Bishop of London not concurring, but presenting a report of his own. Told me also that Sir Stafford Northcote was prepared to offer the See of Bombay, vacant to-day, to the Dean of Cape Town."

The Bishop wrote to Dean Douglas:

"Hull, July 6th, 1868.

"My dear Dean—On hearing that the offer to lay your name before the Queen went out on the 25th, I went to see Sir Stafford Northcote, to learn all I could that may be useful to you. . . . Both Sir Stafford Northcote and Sir Bartle Frere (formerly Governor of Bombay, a very nice pleasing man, and an excellent Churchman) advised your coming home. You would thereby get acquainted with men connected with India;

e.g., the Council, on which Sir Bartle now is;—interchange opinions, and perhaps learn a good deal. I told Sir Stafford that you probably might wish to be consecrated by your own Metropolitan, and that a consecration in India would probably do much good. He seemed to concur in this. . . . Sir Bartle Frere said that you would have the work of three Bishops, and probably travel five months in the year. . . . You will be interested in your legal position. Abbott's *Practical Analysis of the Diocese of Calcutta*, which you will find in the lowest shelf behind the door in my study, will give you interesting information on this point. I need scarce say that I am looking out for a man to succeed you. I have several good men in view, but none equal to yourself. . . . You will see the proceedings in Convocation, and thank God for them. At last the greatest Synod has spoken, and the Church of England is cleared, so far, from an alliance with heresy. There would have been a disruption had the Bishops faltered. . . . —— is making me feel what I have often told you, that Deans are the greatest natural enemies of Bishops!!"

"*June* 21*st*, Preached three times in the suburbs of London—Blackheath, S. James' Hatcham, and Forest Hill."

June 24th, the Nativity of S. John the Baptist, was to have been the day of consecration for Mr. Macrorie as well as for the new Bishop of Hereford (Dr. Atlay), but the question of the Mandate[1] was still unsettled, and once again the ceremony had to be delayed. The Metropolitan was staying at Albury, where he had a meeting, at which "the Duke of Northumberland took the chair, saying that he came down purposely to show his respect for me as a maintainer of the Faith who had met with but little sympathy or support from the Bishops of the Church. Returned to town in the evening in time to hear the Bishop of Cork preach the anniversary sermon for S. P. G. in Westminster Abbey."

[1] "The Duke has proposed to the Archbishop that he should consider whether it would not be well for his Grace to ask for a mandate to consecrate another Bishop for South Africa. Will you think whether it would not be well to do this, and advise the Archbishop?"—*Letter to Bishop Wilberforce.*

"27*th*, Morning spent, 1st, in communication with Lord Carnarvon about his motion relating to Natal; 2nd, Talk with S. Oxon about the same; 3rd, Unsatisfactory conversation with Sir F. Rogers about the issue of the mandate.

"*S. Peter's Day*, Twenty-first anniversary of my consecration. Twenty-one troubled years! During that time a great change, thank God, has taken place in the Church of South Africa. How much greater might have been the change, how much deeper the work, had another been in my place! I trust that I am deeply conscious how much personal defects have impeded the work. God give me more grace. . . . Went to S. Augustine's, Canterbury, for their anniversary. S. P. G. meeting in the evening. The Dean of Canterbury, who took the Chair, made me very angry by intimating, through the Secretary, that he hoped I would not touch upon Colenso! I replied that I was quite willing not to go to the meeting, but that if I went, I should certainly touch upon the subject; and I did so amid the loud applause of the meeting.

"*June* 30*th*, The Committee of Bishops' Report on Dr. Colenso's deposition was read in the Upper House of Convocation after many petitions, all praying the House to acknowledge the validity of the sentence, had been presented by the Archbishop, by the Bishop of Rochester from 14,800 Clergy and Laity; by the Bishop of Oxford from 1,300 Clergy, and by others. The Report was as follows:—

"'I. That although on the supposition of the invalidity of the letters patent the Bishop of Cape Town can claim no coercive jurisdiction as Metropolitan, yet regard being had

"'1, To the early existence and authority of the office of Metropolitan in the Church; and

"'2, To the acceptance of the Bishop of Cape Town as Metropolitan by the Church at home, and by the Church in South Africa, and to the assent of the Crown as witnessed by the letters patent, we must consider the Bishop of Cape Town to have been fully entitled to act as Metropolitan of South Africa in the question of the Bishop of Natal.

"'II. That the Dean of Cape Town and the Archdeacon of

Graham's Town and George Town having delivered formal charges against the Bishop of Natal for heretical teaching, the Bishop of Cape Town, in virtue of his office as Metropolitan, cited the said Bishop of Natal before him.

"'III. That with regard to the proceedings before the Metropolitan in the Cathedral Church, we are of opinion that they were conducted with due reference to the functions of a Metropolitan presumed to have been conferred by the letters patent, and with due reference to the principles and precedents furnished by the English Church since the Reformation, and accepted by that Church as canonical; and further, we are of opinion that the granting of the appeal to the Archbishop of Canterbury was in due accordance with the tenor of the letters patent in which the said office was presumed to have been conferred.

"'IV. With regard to the proceedings in Synod, which were superadded with a view to meeting any question which might be raised as to the coercive jurisdiction of the Bishop of Cape Town as presumed to have been conveyed by the letters patent, we are not equally agreed, some of us doubting whether these proceedings fully satisfied the requirements of a canonical trial before a Provincial Synod.

"'(1.) Because the accused was not formally cited before the Synod as a Synod, but before the Bishop of Cape Town as Metropolitan, with the advice and assistance of such of the Suffragan Bishops of the Province as could conveniently be called together.

"'(2.) Because the Comprovincial Bishops were not cited to the Synod as a Synod, because they were not all personally present, and because the number of those actually present was less than that required by the early canons of the Church.

"'(3.) Because an appeal was granted, after the proceedings were concluded, to the Archbishop of Canterbury, which, on the assumption that the Synod was duly convened and the proceedings canonical, could not have been so granted in accordance with the decisions of some important early canons.'

"'Others of us again do not consider these objections suffi-

cient to invalidate the canonicity of the proceedings in the Synod:—

"'(1.) Because we deem that the alleged necessity of a double citation is purely technical, and that such double citation was not essential to its validity, the accused having been duly cited to appear before the Metropolitan with his Suffragans, whose advice and assistance it was intimated would be given at the time and place mentioned in the citation.

"'(2.) Because all the Bishops of the Province were summoned to the hearing of the case, and those who could attend were present during the trial, and expressed their opinions; whilst, of the two absent Suffragans, one sent afterwards his adherence to the judgment, and the other accepted the sentence as spiritually valid.

"'(3.) Because, before the sentence was pronounced, it was submitted to and approved by the Bishops present in a Synod which had been summoned by the Metropolitan.

"'(4.) Because we consider that the allowance by the Bishop of Cape Town of an appeal to the Archbishop of Canterbury was made by him as Metropolitan, from his Court, in obedience to the possible requirements of his letters patent, and could not affect the judgment of the Synod; and because we believe that the allowance of an appeal, which was never prosecuted, cannot affect a precedent sentence; and further, because we believe that the Patriarchal character of the Metropolitan See of Canterbury would justify the allowance of an appeal from the decree of the Provincial Synod.

"'V. With regard, however, to the whole case, with its extreme difficulty, the various complications, the grave doubts in reference to points of law yet unsettled, and the apparent impossibility of any other mode of action, we are of opinion—(1.) That substantial justice was done to the accused. (2.) That though the sentence, having been pronounced by a tribunal not acknowledged by the Queen's courts, whether civil or ecclesiastical, can claim no legal effect, the Church, as a spiritual body, may rightly accept its validity.'"

The Bishop of London (who read this Report) stated, that

in accordance with the same rule which had guided the Committee, he had appended his own views of the matter, which were as follows:—"I am unable to append my signature to the foregoing, inasmuch as it does not set forth those grounds which have chiefly prevented my acknowledging the validity of the trial and sentence:—

"(1st), I consider the trial to have been altogether set aside by the decision given by the highest Court in the Empire that it was null and void in law.

"(2d), I consider that, if it had been thought right that a trial of a purely spiritual character was to take place, without reference to any binding legal authority on the part of the Metropolitan or his Suffragans assembled in Synod, such trial could only be held in virtue of a compact; and I find no proof that Bishop Colenso entered into such a compact with Bishop Gray, otherwise than on the supposition that the letters patent were valid, and that Bishop Gray possessed coercive jurisdiction.

"(3rd), Independently of my views as to the general invalidity of the trial, I entertain grave doubts whether, in conducting the proceeding, Bishop Gray did not, in several important points, so far depart from the principles recognised in English courts of justice, as to make it highly probable that, if the trial had been valid, and had become the subject of appeal on the merits of the case to any well-constituted court ecclesiastical, the sentence would have been set aside. These difficulties have all along made me feel that the case of Bishop Colenso cannot be satisfactorily disposed of without fresh proceedings, in lieu of those which I understand to have entirely failed. A. C. LONDON."

The Bishop of Llandaff (Ollivant) was the first to speak in strong support of the Metropolitan's line, going into a learned disquisition in refutation of the Bishop of London, ending by affirming that it was not possible "to come to any other conclusion than that the Bishop of Cape Town did everything that he could that was essential to the justice of the case;"—and he moved the adoption of the Report. The Bishop of Lichfield

(Selwyn) seconded the motion, saying that it seemed to him that the Bishop of Llandaff had entirely exhausted the subject. What they were asking for was simply a confirmation of the spiritual sentence. It was not pretended that there was any legal remedy; but he might say that the sentence was passed with the universal consent of the Anglican Church, and they were there assembled to give their assent to it simply as a spiritual act. Of course practical results would follow. One result would be, that the faithful in Natal, who were now deprived of an orthodox Bishop, would have their wants supplied.

The Bishop of Ely (H. Browne) agreed with the Bishop of Landaff's conclusions. He thought, however, that the African Church was entirely disconnected from the Province of Canterbury, as well as from the State, and that all the English Bishops had to do was to accept the deposition her Bishops had made, not to assert any power or voice in the case.

The Bishop of Salisbury (Hamilton), (whose health was failing, and whose last appearance in Convocation was at this session) did not agree in thinking it would have been well if no appeal had been made to the Upper House of Convocation. He did not believe that synodically they had anything to do with the matter, but placing it on another ground, he was thankful that, wherever the Bishops met together, whether at the Lambeth Conference or in Convocation, they should have the opportunity of expressing their deep sympathy with and cordial approval of the course which the Metropolitan of South Africa had adopted. He thought there ought to be no doubt that the sentence of deposition was a legal deposition. He was quite sure that the feeling which had animated himself throughout was that of their Lordships. They would have been more ready to speak and vote on the subject, more ready to offer the expression of their sympathy to the great Metropolitan of South Africa, if they had not felt that Dr. Colenso had inflicted so grave and serious an injury on the Church, that they could hardly trust their feelings to act with justice towards him. The conduct of Dr. Colenso had, he feared, shaken the faith of many of the members of our Church, and the consequence was that persons

who had been obliged to deal with such cases felt it difficult to deal strict justice to Dr. Colenso. That he could distinctly affirm to be his own case. The Bishop ended by saying that the conclusion to which the Committee had come would strengthen the Metropolitan's hands and comfort his heart, for he would have the assurance of the Convocation of Canterbury that they believed him to have acted most wisely, and that substantial justice had been done, and that his brethren were prepared to support him in any future action he might take to give legal validity to the sentence passed on Dr. Colenso.

The House then adjourned; and when the debate was renewed the following day, July 1st, the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol (Ellicott) made a long and able speech in support of the decision. Concluding, he said the inability to get rid of a man holding heretical opinions might be supposed to be an evil which seemed inherent in our theory of any kind of connection between Church and State. But it was not so. It might be the result of such a connection that he may still hold his titular designation and his salary, but there is no ground now for asserting that the State intended to recognise him in his spiritual position. Far otherwise. He believed that now all parties would see that the justice of the case required the sending a rightful pastor to Natal, and he hoped and believed that the highest powers in England felt that whoever was sent forth upon that mission should carry with him their fullest recognition of his spiritual authority.

The Bishops of Lincoln (Jackson) and Bangor (Campbell) spoke in support of their adoption of the Report; and then the Bishop of London entered upon his own peculiar views, which were resisted by other Bishops, especially the Bishop of Oxford, who corrected one expression, which seemed to imply that the House adopted his individual report. A little discussion ensued as to the way in which that was to be sent to the Lower House, "communicating" it being objected to, as implying that the Lower House was asked to *agree* to it. Finally the motion was framed thus: "That the Report be adopted and communicated to the

Lower House, and that the remarks thereon of the Lord Bishop of London be also sent to the Lower House." The Bishop of Oxford spoke afterwards at length in correction of an expression used, most likely unintentionally, by the Bishop of London as to the proceedings having been "illegal," which he emphatically showed they were not. After some short observations from different Prelates, the venerable President (who was never to assist at another session) expressed his cordial and hearty sympathy in all the efforts made to put an end to the sad state of affairs in Natal. He had always considered that the nearest approach which could be made to primitive proceedings had been made (by the Metropolitan); and he could not but believe that although the proceedings which had been taken in this case might not have all the weight which some might wish, yet, so far as ecclesiastical power and the spiritual power of the Church were concerned, those proceedings were justified, and ample justice had been done. "So far as regards our own position," his Grace said, "we are practically a Synod of this Province of the Church of England; and although it may be perfectly true that we owe submission to the State, and as a Synod have no power to make canons except we receive the sanction of the Crown, yet as a spiritual Synod we still continue to be the ancient spiritual Synod, and we have a full right to act as such." The motion was then put and carried unanimously.

The Lower House was occupied with the Irish Church Bill that day, and it was not till Friday, July 3rd, that the Natal question could be heard there. Canon Seymour then moved a resolution thanking the Upper House for communicating their Report, and "declaring the concurrence of the Lower House in their Lordships' judgment as to the acceptance of the sentence."

He was seconded by the Rev. J. W. Joyce, who thought everything to be said on the subject had been already said, and therefore only alluded to the pain every generous heart must feel at having to carry what was virtually a sentence of excommunication. The Rev. J. Bramston spoke next, the Dean of Westminster (Stanley) at some length opposing the Resolution;

Lord Alwyne Compton supporting it. Canon Blakesley moved an amendment, which would make the Lower House merely thank the Upper House for giving them information, without accepting their decision, and the Dean of Westminster seconded it. Dr. Fraser, the Dean of Ely, (Goodwin) and Chancellor Massingberd, took part in some discussion, and the amendment was put to the House and negatived. Afterwards, some further conversation as to how the Bishop of London's note was to be acknowledged occurred; the Dean of Westminster affirming that it came down to the Lower House with exactly the same authority as the Report, and there was no distinction between them. "Excepting," the Prolocutor remarked, "that the Report of the Committee *had* been adopted by the Upper, and the note of the Bishop of London had *not* been so adopted, and obviously would not be adopted by the Lower House." Thereupon the Resolution was passed, and the House proceeded to other subjects.

The Metropolitan was in the Upper House on both days during the debate. His comment is: "It is not what I should have prepared, and is, I think, a feeble production, but it saves the Church of England from complicity with heresy." On the 3rd he heard the debate in the Lower House likewise, and writes: "There was no division—there could not have been more than three or four noes. We have thus a synodical decision of the Province of Canterbury affirming the canonical deposition of the Bishop of Natal."

On Friday, July 3rd, Lord Carnarvon brought forward the subject of the two despatches sent to Natal, in the House of Lords. He observed that the Natal authorities had "so far mistaken the tenor of the first despatch as to convey a most extraordinary warning to all civilians in the Government employ to take no part in the consecration, and give no countenance to it, under pain of the displeasure of her Majesty's Government. He need not point out how improper it was that such a communication should have been so addressed. He was further informed, though he confessed he was very reluctant to believe that such a thing could have occurred, that the military officers in the place were induced to sign a document pledging

themselves to take no part in the consecration. From some other circumstances which had reached him, he was afraid that the local authorities had gone, not only beyond the instructions of his noble friend, but beyond all constitutional limits." Lord Carnarvon then alluded to a Clergyman who had been deprived of a grant for his school, because he declined to acknowledge Dr. Colenso as his Bishop, and went on to say that "there were a large number of poor men dependent in a great degree on the local Government, who had been prevented attending certain churches to which they would otherwise have gone, in consequence of their fear of giving offence to the local Government. . . . From these facts he apprehended that there was much going on in the nature of religious persecution, and he thought the matter was well worthy the consideration of his noble friend the Secretary for the Colonies."

The Duke of Buckingham spoke in a very straightforward way, agreeing that the occurrences in the Colony to which Lord Carnarvon had alluded could be called by no other name than persecution; but they had occurred without any authority from home, and some, at least, during the absence of the Governor. The Duke further said that having had an interview with the Bishop of Cape Town, and learnt his Lordship's views as to matters, he had felt it his duty to write the second despatch, which he had endeavoured to make more acceptable. "He could only say that he regretted there had been the slightest misconception on the subject; not one word had been intended to give the slightest offence to his Lordship."

Lord Houghton having expressed it as his opinion that Dr. Colenso had been treated with injustice, was rebuked by Lord Lyttleton and the Bishop of Oxford, who gave tolerably strong evidence to prove the contrary, and concluded by saying that he "could not let the statement of the noble Lord go uncontradicted, though of course it had been made in that absolute ignorance of the subject which it was natural he should possess, and equally natural he should express."

A few days before (June 29th), a deputation from the

English Church Union, headed by Earl Nelson, went to Lambeth to present a Declaration signed by upwards of 20,000 communicants of the Church of England to the Archbishop, renouncing all communion with Dr. Colenso, until such time as he might repent of his errors. The Archbishop made a brief, but energetic speech in reply, saying he thought his own opinions concerning Dr. Colenso were sufficiently well known. "I have repeatedly declared that I believe him to be in grievous error, and that I think he has been spiritually deposed from his office. Undoubtedly," his Grace ended by saying, "my sympathies go entirely with those who repudiate his doctrines, and have done their best to stop the mischief."

On July 3rd the Metropolitan held a meeting of friends at S. P. G., to consider about the formation of an association for providing, I. An income for the orthodox Bishop, so long as it might be needed; and II. The support of his own work. It was unanimously agreed to form the association, with Lord Nelson as Chairman, and H. Dunell, Esq., Treasurer; the Rev. the Hon. Henry Douglas and the Rev. E. Harston, secretaries. The Bishop mentioned the fact of the Duke of Buckingham having invited the Archbishop of Canterbury to apply for a mandate, stating that he would issue one in order to relieve all concerned from the dangers of *præmunire* if the new Bishop were consecrated in England; which the Metropolitan said it was very desirable he should be, as the distances which the African Bishops had to travel were so enormous. Moreover, those who had been deluded by the assertion that Dr. Colenso was "the Queen's Bishop," would be undeceived if a Bishop went out with the full sanction of Crown and Church of England. The Archbishop had expressed his anxiety to render all assistance in his power, but he had left England now.[1] On this same busy Friday, July 3rd, the Bishop of Cape Town also had an interview with the Duke of Buckingham. "He was very pleasant, read me part of his despatch about the school in

[1] "His Grace's last act was to write to the Queen's Advocate, his Vicar-General, expressing his desire that arrangements might be made for the consecration of the new Bishop in this country."—*Colonial Church Chronicle*, September 1868.

Natal, promised as soon as he got the law officers' opinion to write to me fully."

These important days over, there were more engagements all about the country to be fulfilled. July 5th found the Bishop at Hull: on the 6th he and Mrs. Gray "went in seven different vehicles to Louth, distant only 30 miles,"—thence to Holbeach, Lincoln (where they were the guests of Chancellor Massingberd), Gainsborough, and back to London on the 11th.

For some little time past, a great anxiety already alluded to had come upon the Metropolitan in the shape of Dean Green's difficulties in connection with the Bishop-elect, Mr. Macrorie. Loving the Dean heartily as he did, admiring his character, and the stedfast battle he had fought for the Faith (how often he had called him "a true Confessor, if there ever was one!"), it was intensely painful to him to find any want of harmony in their views now, when the struggle seemed well-nigh over, and the conquest over evil won. There are frequent and sorrowful allusions to this subject in the Bishop's Journals, notes of conversations with the Dean concerning the matter—he objected to the mandate, to the Archbishop's assisting the Metropolitan, instead of *vice versa*, etc. etc.,—objected so strongly that he even declined making a joint appeal with the Bishop-elect for funds, because doing so would imply recognition of him, for which he was not prepared. Dean Green further wrote to Mr. Macrorie to say that if he were consecrated under mandate, he would publicly protest in the name of the Church of Natal. All this was very harassing, and led to numerous consultations and discussions with the Bishop of Oxford, Mr. Butler, and others, during a round of visits to Chilton, Stanford, Reading, Hadbury, Farnbro', Banbury, Kidderminster, Lancing (for the laying the first stone of the School Chapel), and Salisbury, where, on July 30th, the Annual S. P. G. Festival took place; and besides all the public functions, two private meetings were held in the Bishop of Salisbury's library, between himself, the Metropolitan, Bishop of Oxford, Mr. Macrorie, and Dean Green, in order to talk over the latter's objections to the consecration in England by mandate, and by the Archbishop.

"The Bishop of Oxford answered him kindly, and I hope removed some of his scruples.

"31*st*, Long talk with Green before leaving. . . . Afterwards he came round and was his own self again. We had much conversation about it all, and he promised that he would act heartily with Macrorie. Left P.M. for Glover's, Brading, Isle of Wight."

Bishop Gray went on to Rownhams, Exeter (where a few hearty friends formed a Branch Cape Town Association, as also at Plymouth), Barnstaple, Ilfracombe, Lynton, Ashperton, Stoke-Edith, Bristol (where again a Branch Association was formed, and where the Bishop was the guest of Mr. Gibbs at Tyntesfield). On Sunday, August 16th, the Bishop preached at All Saints, Clifton, and the next day returned to London, being now really anxious about the delay at the Colonial Office, which bid fair to hinder his return to Africa. He wrote to the Bishop of Oxford:

"Bristol, August 15th, 1868.

"The Archbishop says: 'If the mandate comes, telegraph to me, and I will order the commission to be prepared at once, and sent to me for signature.' I cannot, however, bring the Duke to do anything. I wrote a week ago to say that I had taken the passages for my party, and must immediately come to a decision as to whether I went on the 9th or postponed my voyage, and asked his Grace to let me know what he intended to do. I have not heard from him. He is really behaving very ill. The Attorney-General says that the law officers sent in their report long ago. We should fix on Bishops to take part in the consecration. Macrorie says in a letter to-day that you ordained him Priest and Deacon, and he hopes that anyhow you will take part. He would also like the Bishop of Rochester, and the Primus of Scotland, who behaved so well about consecration there. I suppose that you or I might ask these, and Colonial Bishops too, and that these would not be in the commission. I believe that I shall have to postpone my voyage, to my great loss. I must give notice in a day or two, or forfeit my passage money, about £500."

To the BISHOP of OXFORD.

"21 Norfolk Square, August 20th, 1868.

"My dear Bishop—I have just had a conversation with ——, which has satisfied me that the Duke is merely putting off a decision to wear me out and get me out of the way. —— tells me that his last act was to draft a further reference to the law officers. He said that he did not know whether it was still under consideration of the Duke, or sent to the law officers, that Karslake was in Scotland, Twiss away, no Solicitor-General—at the rate they were going at the matter might not be settled for a year! I replied by telling him that I would postpone my voyage, but that I felt it a great grievance that I could not get yea or nay out of the Duke, he having invited the Archbishop just three months ago to apply for the mandate. I am at a loss to know what to do, but am writing to the Company to ask leave for a few days to decide. I am persuaded that all this trickery will recoil upon the Government. I do not want to worry you with my troubles, but I thought you should know that I see no prospect of the consecration being in England. I should have respected the man, if, two months ago, he had said that it could not be done. I have written twice to the Duke, telling him of the position in which I stood, and of the necessity of my deciding about my voyage. He has given me no answer."

S. Bartholomew's Day, August 24th, had been the last day on which it was hoped the consecration would take place, but once more it had to be deferred owing to these tedious and incomprehensible delays at the Colonial Office.

The Metropolitan went that day to Lavington, after a morning spent in business connected with the supplying the place of the Dean of Cape Town, now going to the See of Bombay. The Bishop of Rochester met him there, and the three Bishops took much helpful counsel together, enjoying walks before breakfast and rides over the downs. The Metropolitan was at times sorely worn and exhausted in spirit, for it seemed as if

in some way or other every one disappointed or hindered him, while he was working with the one single desire to do his Master's work.

"*September 2nd,* Letters from Mr. Brett, Dr. Littledale, Carter, etc., about withdrawing aid from the fund for support of Macrorie, because he had not put down evening communions in his parish, which he found there. Wrote strong remonstrances, pointing out that Macrorie had no taste or sympathy for such practices, but felt difficulty in putting them down at once. Complained of the disposition of Churchmen, after urging me on, and inducing me to commit myself to the guaranteeing an income for a new Bishop, to back out and leave me to bear the punishment arising from trusting too much to others.

"3*rd,* Madagascar Committee meeting.

"8*th,* Wrote to the Bishops of Graham's Town, S. Helena, Free State, and Tozer, fixing S. Paul's Day, January 25th, 1869, for Macrorie's consecration at Cape Town, and summoning them to a Provincial Synod on the 27th. . . .

"11*th,* To Mr. T. Keble, at Bisley, near Stroud. Much talk with him about his dear brother, and Church matters. . .

"13*th,* Preached in the evening at S. Lawrence, Jewry, on the anniversary of the Mission Services established last year with reference to the Lambeth Conference.

"16*th,* Wrote a strong letter of complaint to the Duke of Buckingham as to his conduct, he not even condescending to answer my letters. Shall not send it for a day or two.

"18*th,* Sent in to-day a formal letter of complaint to the Duke, which I may have to publish. I state that I, and the Church through me, are aggrieved by the course pursued by the Government with regard to the issue of the mandate, and I assign my reasons. I complain also of the way in which he has treated me with regard to filling up two Ecclesiastical appointments in my Diocese."

All this time Bishop Gray was moving about as usual, preaching and speaking in various places—often "wearied out" —and worn in spirit, as his Journal tells. At Yarmouth, September 20th, he "preached twice to more than 3,000 people in

the noble parish church; the effort to make myself heard was great, and I was very tired." He was sleeping badly, and was much worn and depressed, and all the more so by a renewal of difficulties with Dean Green, and by anxiety as to the provision made for his people at Cape Town, Dean Douglas having arrived in England. On the 24th, Mrs. Gray left him for the first time since they had been in England, to receive the Dean and Mrs. Douglas. She had shared all his harassing journeys and anxieties, often ill and exhausted herself, but conscious that her presence and sympathy, her care of details taken off his mind, and often her reading to him through those weary sleepless nights, enabled him to get through a pressure of toil which would otherwise probably have overwhelmed him. On the 25th he followed to London, and there met Dean Douglas, Mr. Macrorie, and Mr. Wilkinson. There was much to discuss that was painful; and the weak staff left in Africa filled the Bishop with consternation. "Thus anxieties pour in upon me," he wrote, "when already overwhelmed. Arranged with Wilkinson to remain in England working up the endowment of the Zulu See. Much talk with the Dean."

"26*th*, Bad night. Preached at S. Cyprian's.

"27*th*, Preached at Forest Hill in morning. S. John's, Hammersmith, in evening."

To the Bishop of Oxford.

"October 1st, 1868.

"My dearest Bishop—Before I leave I must write you one line of brotherly love, to thank you once more for all that you have done and laboured to do in behalf of our struggling Church in Africa these many years. We shall, probably, not meet again here below. May we do so there where we hope to be, where God shall wipe away all tears from every eye.

"I wish that I could report anything comforting, but I cannot.

"I. The Bishop-designate of Bombay has been with me for some days. He brings me painful news from Africa. The worst is that dear Thomas has resigned his Archdeaconry.

"II. On the 18th September I wrote a letter of complaint to the Duke, who has four letters of mine before him unanswered, including one recommending Alder to succeed the Dean. Two days ago Elliot wrote at the Duke's request to say that he had never received my letters!!! and asking again for Alder's name. I meant him to understand that if he did not treat me fairly, I should publish that letter, which will do the Government no good. I am reproached on all sides for not consecrating in England. I must, before I leave, assign the reason.—Ever, my dearest Bishop, most affectionately yours,

"R. CAPETOWN."

To this Bishop Wilberforce replied with characteristic warmth. He wrote from

"The Palace, Armagh, October 6th, 1868.

"My dearest Brother—Your letter filled my eyes with tears. I cannot bear to believe that I shall never see you and your dear wife again on earth. I feel a strong conviction that we *shall* meet. But that and all is in His Hands. May His blessing, my very dear and most honoured brother, rest upon you. To you it has been given indeed not only to believe in Christ, but to suffer for Him as few have suffered. Yet He sees you toiling in rowing, for the wind is contrary, and He will at the fourth watch give you a calm. I am utterly sick at heart as to this whole treatment of you and the cause by the Government. . . . I should like very much to know if anything has passed between you and the Archbishop. How strange and entangled is the whole Ecclesiastical state! This Congress most unequivocally showed the great rise in the Irish Clergy in Church principles. It was they who, after welcoming —— most cordially, would not patiently hear him declare the Ministry to be a human arrangement. Everywhere where I have been in Ireland I see signs of life and growth; and that at this moment this blow should be dealt it, and from the hand which deals it, is one of the darkest things I have lived to see. My dear dear friend, may God bless you! I have your kind loving voice ringing in my ear as I write; your anxious, your happy countenance

floats before my eyes, and I long once more to grasp your faithful hand." . . .

The friends never did meet again in this life.

"*October 3rd,* Entered to-day upon my 60th year. What a year of controversy, anxiety, and toil this last has been! May God so overrule events that hereafter His Church in Africa, and here too, may serve Him in all godly quietness. May He give me more grace that the short remainder of my life may be more pure and holy and self-denying, and that I may give myself more entirely to Him and to the work which He has given me to do. We had a family party at Edward's, who has come up to town to see us off."

That last week was a full and trying one. People were coming up to town to see the Bishop once more, some on business matters, some on spiritual concerns, some out of affection or friendship. On October 4th (17th Sunday after Trinity) he preached at S. Matthias', Stoke Newington. On the 5th there was an important meeting at S. P. C. K. of the secretaries and treasurer of the Bishops' Association. A series of farewell services were held at S. Lawrence, Jewry. October 6th was the principal day, beginning with celebration at 7.30. At 11 o'clock there was a second celebration, when the Bishop of Rochester preached the first sermon, from words which fell on many a heart as peculiarly fitting: "And now behold, I go bound in the spirit unto Jerusalem, not knowing the things which shall befall me there" (Acts xx. 22). At 1 o'clock Litany, and a sermon from the Bishop-elect, Mr. Macrorie; and at evensong, 8 o'clock, the Bishop of Cape Town preached, taking as his text, "My Kingdom is not of this world" (S. John xviii. 30). Those who were present at this service will not soon forget how, when it was ended, the faithful crowded round the Bishop of Cape Town seeking his blessing, so that the whole passage-way was stopped, and it was only slowly that he could get through the church from the sacristy to the door, giving the benediction sought to the lines of devout men who knelt awaiting it. The Bishop wrote of the services as "very glorious," though he was well-nigh exhausted by the end of the

day. Meetings of various kinds—S. P. G.,[1] S. P. C. K., and Cape Town Association—connected with his African work; visits to the Colonial Office, etc. etc., filled up every hour.

On the last day he wrote to the Bishop of Oxford:

"53 Cambridge Terrace, October 8th, 1868.

"My dearest Bishop—I had no very important conversation with the Archbishop. He complained of the Duke of Buckingham's treatment of him. I believe that he has three letters unanswered relating to Labuan, and the See of Mauritius is nowhere. The Archbishop complained of the Duke's conduct about Gibraltar. He suggested nothing to me, and knowing him, I hardly looked for this. . . . I mean to try and see Disraeli to-day, and complain to him. . . . We had most hearty services on Tuesday, and I had a most affectionate meeting of associates afterwards. . . . 4 P.M., I have seen Dizzy. He says there has been no refusal upon the part of the Cabinet about the Mandate,—was very courteous and kind. Promised to see the Duke. Did not pledge himself to any particular course. Asked how he should communicate with me. Is to do so through Mowbray, who will send his letter to Douglas as my Commissary. I have told Douglas to take no public step without communicating with you.

"We have had several abortive Madagascar meetings. The Bishops of London, Mauritius, and myself, were to select a Bishop. On leaving I have said that no one so represents all my views as you do, and asked that you might be elector in room of me. I hope you will consent.—Ever affectionately yours, R. CAPETOWN."

In his Journal the Bishop says: "Interview with Mr. Disraeli. Complained of the Duke of Buckingham's treatment of me, and of the Church through me, in the matter of the Mandate, and of the appointment of a successor to Dean

[1] Canon Hawkins, so long Secretary to S. P. G. and to the Colonial Bishoprics Council, died October 5th, 1868, warmly regretted by his many friends, one of whom (also a staunch supporter of Bishop Gray's) had already passed from this life since the Lambeth Synod, September 1868—Bishop Fulford of Montreal.

Douglas. Left him a copy of my letter to the Duke, of September 18th, in which I had made a formal complaint on these matters. He was frank, cordial, and free-spoken, and promised at once to look into matters, and settle them. He pledged himself to nothing, but to lose no time in coming to a decision." . . . That morning the Bishop and his belongings attended "a large choral celebration" at S. Mary Magdalen, and a farewell gathering took place in the evening at Cambridge Terrace. The next morning, October 9th, they went to Plymouth, where at the very last moment the Metropolitan received the long-delayed letter from the Duke of Buckingham. On a large sheet of blue paper stamped "The Wharf, Millbay, Plymouth," he wrote a few hasty lines to the Bishop of Oxford:

"My dearest Bishop—At the wharf I received the enclosed from the Duke, and another letter saying that he approves of Alder for Dean. It is clear from the Duke's message that —— has been at him. I think that the best thing now, if possible, would be for the Government to say they are prepared to issue the Mandate, and that the consecration should take place in Africa. Will you write to the Archbishop? You will see that the Duke now rests his doubts not upon law, but upon difference of opinion within the Church.—Ever affectionately yours, R. CAPETOWN."

This letter, and one to the Archbishop, were entrusted to the Bishop's son, who in posting the former adds in pencil:—"I have seen them safe on board—they started about 11 this morning (Saturday, October 10th), a fair wind and a nice day." That letter to the Archbishop was the last. The gentle, loving, and well-loved Primate, Archbishop Longley, died on the 27th of that month, of bronchitis, to the real grief of numbers far beyond his immediate family circle, and to the infinite loss of the Church, which, if his gentle hands sometimes failed to guide with unerring firmness and decision, he at least ruled in the loving spirit of an Apostle, and with staunch fidelity to her ancient Creeds and Faith.

CHAPTER XII.

OCTOBER, 1868, TO SEPTEMBER, 1872.

GATHERING A SISTERHOOD — VOYAGE OUT: MADEIRA — BEGINNING OF S. GEORGE'S HOME — RULE OF LIFE — ADDRESS — INNER RULE — SPIRITUAL DIRECTION — LETTERS ON SPIRITUAL SUBJECTS — CORRESPONDENCE WITH BISHOP WILBERFORCE — CONSECRATION OF BISHOP MACRORIE — SYNOD — VISITATION — FOREST FIRE — TROUBLES — CHURCH PROPERTY IN NATAL — FRAMING OF CANONS — IRISH CHURCH — DEATH OF MRS. GLOVER — PROVINCIAL SYNOD — DECLARATION OF FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES — CONSTITUTION — CANONS — SEVERE ILLNESS — BISHOP OF ZULULAND — LETTERS TO MISS MACKENZIE: TO BISHOP WILBERFORCE — SUDDEN VOYAGE TO ENGLAND FOR MRS. GRAY — DANGEROUS SYMPTOMS — WORK IN ENGLAND — BISHOPRIC OF MADAGASCAR — CONSECRATION OF BISHOP WEBB — RETURN TO CAPE TOWN — ROUGH VOYAGE — INCREASE OF MRS. GRAY'S ILLNESS — CALAMITIES OF FRANCE — MRS. GRAY'S LAST ILLNESS AND DEATH — CORRESPONDENCE — DEPARTURE OF BISHOP COTTERILL FOR EDINBURGH — RITUALISM — PURCHAS JUDGMENT — PATIENCE AND GENTLENESS NEEDED — S. THOMAS, MALMESBURY — BISHOP'S REPLY ON RITUAL MATTERS — VISITATION IN NAMAQUA LAND — CONSECRATION OF BISHOP MERRIMAN — EFFORTS AT UNION WITH THE DUTCH CHURCH — GENERAL REUNION — THE DIAMOND FIELDS — GRAND DUKE ALEXIS — BROTHERHOODS — VISITATION TOUR — ATHANASIAN CREED — PROPOSALS TO CREATE A SEE OF GEORGE — DEATH OF MR. WILLIAM GRAY — LAST ILLNESS — LAST CONFIRMATION AND SERVICE — DEATH — BURIAL.

DURING the last year spent in England Bishop Gray had, amid all his other more public labours, been diligently engaged in looking out for the material wherewith to carry out the resolution expressed by his Synod of establishing penitentiary work at Cape Town; as also to effect the many good works among his people which the Bishop felt could be more effectually carried out by a Religious Community than in any other way. To this end he had visited nearly all the Communities working in England, and had consulted with their founders, superiors, and Wardens. He had also seen a large number of ladies in all parts of England who felt a desire to work in this way for God, and who were prepared to put

themselves into the Bishop's hands for that purpose. Of course a great many such fell through from a variety of causes —health, objections of friends, reasonable and unreasonable; and an absence of real fitness for the work in the candidates themselves on closer investigation. However, before the time for sailing arrived, the Bishop had arranged to take eight ladies out with him, none of whom had been members of any existing Community, but whom he hoped to train and mould into a Sisterhood himself. It was a considerable undertaking, and he owned afterwards that he felt himself to be a bold man! However, the first start was prosperous. When off Madeira he wrote to his brother Mr. Edward Gray:

"October 15th.

"I send you a line just to say that we are all well, and that the weather has been as favourable as it could be, and that I am not quite overwhelmed with the charge of my eleven daughters! We have already got tolerably intimate with most of them, and like them very much. Some of them are clearly very sterling women, very sensible, and very nice and high in tone. They have their different gifts, and some will probably be more useful than others, but I am very hopeful about them. I think that most of them will agree. We do what we can to make them feel at ease, and are already getting to know them well. How we shall get over thirty-five days together I do not yet know. There is a great want of occupation on board ship. There is an old Scotch Churchman on board, whose whole soul is in Church matters, who is greatly impressed by seeing this array of self-supporting ladies giving themselves to the work." And writing the same day to his son, the Bishop says: "Your mother and I have been quite well. Blanche very unwell, also some of our ladies. We have got daily prayers established morning and evening, and nearly all the passengers attend; and we shall, D.V., have weekly communion. . . . After prayers we have singing lessons, and after that I give lessons in Dutch, which takes up till luncheon time. Then we read and talk and walk. The kind of life is dull enough, but

in spite of short nights we are getting rest. Your mother is, I think, improving in good looks daily."

And in a letter to Mrs. Williamson, dated "At sea, October 31st, 1868," the Bishop says: "At Madeira I took all my party on shore, and gave them a ride into the hill country and a dinner, which refreshed them greatly. After a hot ride, the Chaplain came to beg me to hold a Confirmation. So I had to hurry through dinner, and take the service. I confirmed there twenty-one years before, the Queen Dowager being present. What years of deep anxiety have intervened! It is a fortnight since we left Madeira, and we are now drawing near to S. Helena. Nearly all are very weary, and some of our party are sick every day. Most of them are all I could wish, and will, I hope, be very valuable workers. They are very varied in their tastes and characters, and there is a little disinclination in some to any rule, but I trust that they will get on well. We are a party of twenty-one. . . . Have a good deal of reading; but life on board is monotonous and uncomfortable, and we shall be very thankful when we reach our destination. . . . The Bishop of Rochester's text at S. Lawrence is frequently present to my mind. I know not what shall befall me on my return to my Diocese; but I see by stray papers which we got on the wide sea that Colenso is going to invoke the aid of the Supreme Court, which will, I doubt not, be given him. . . . The treatment which I have received from the Duke of Buckingham is an encouragement to all to do what they can to thwart and annoy me. There seems not a weapon that Satan can use to defeat this consecration which has not been forged and cast." In the same spirit he wrote to his brother: "We are getting the rest now which is to fit us to meet the many difficulties and distresses which I know await me at the Cape. Oh when, my dear brother, shall I be permitted, like others, to serve God and work in peace! No one knows what it costs me to be always contending, struggling, warring with others! However, it *is* my proper work, because given me, and not, whatever men may say or think, of my seeking."

Just off S. Helena the Bishop wrote to his son: "I like

my ladies. . . . There are some a little against any rules. I have been preparing these, and also counsels, for when I formally pledge them to observe the rules in my chapel. I am able to work about seven hours a day. Rise at 5.30. Walk till 7.30. Read till 9, when we breakfast. Prayers at 10, then practise hymns, and I give my Dutch lesson. Work from 12 to 4, when I have my bath. After dinner at 5 we can do but little. I am getting through a good deal of reading, and have written one sermon."

The Bishop and his party landed November 11th. The day had been cloudy, so that the ship was not signalled till the evening, and it was quite dark when they landed, much to the disappointment of the people, who had intended to give the Metropolitan a hearty reception. Even so, there was a goodly crowd gathered to greet him, and the Cathedral bells were set pealing, but the triumphal arches and decorations prepared by the poor coloured people were passed in darkness, and it was far on in the night when the Bishop and Mrs. Gray reached Bishop's Court, with the large family they had brought to that "hotel," as the Bishop truly called it. Overwhelmed with occupation his letters announce him to be, and truly it was so; yet he managed to give up November 17th to the Sisters and their work—the rule[1] which he had drawn up for them. He writes:

"November 18th, 1868.

. . . "There had been little alienations and differences among them, but I have been greatly comforted. They are all, I trust, of one heart and mind, and have behaved very nicely. All here seem disposed to welcome them heartily." On December 2nd the Bishop installed his Sisters in a small house which he had taken temporarily for them, and held a special service in their oratory, which was made as nice and devotional in appearance as they could make it. The few words which he spoke to them on this occasion will never be forgotten by any of those to whom they were addressed.

"My dear Daughters in Christ," the Bishop said, "I

[1] The External Rule will be found in the Appendix X.

have thought it desirable, on the eve of your entering upon the work to which you are about to devote yourselves, to join with you in special prayer and communion, and to offer to you some fatherly counsel. The life upon which you are about to enter is a most blessed one, and will bring with it, I doubt not, its great reward; for you have undertaken to devote yourselves to the immediate service of your God—to the advancement of your Lord's Truth and Kingdom amongst the Heathen and Mohametans, to the care of Christ's poor and sick, to the instruction of the ignorant and young, and, it may be, to the recovery from a life of sin and shame of poor fallen sisters. You have for Christ's Sake left the comforts of home and those dear to you in the flesh, that you may serve Him in all humility in the persons of those who so greatly need your loving ministrations. I cannot doubt that you and your work will be accepted and blessed of Him, Whose you are, Whom you serve; that you will be instruments in God's Hand of great good to the people amid whom you shall dwell; that many in this land will, through you, be led to the foot of the Cross, and find rest and peace and salvation there; that God will, through your endeavours, be glorified, and some little done, at least, towards the accomplishment of those purposes of love which led our Dear Lord to lay down His Life for the world.

"You will, however, I am sure, be yourselves the first to feel how much of your success and usefulness will depend upon what each one of you in herself is before God in the secret life and spirit. We tell upon others for good just in proportion to what we are in ourselves; every fault of ours mars the work of Christ by the effect which it produces on those around us. Your work requires the very highest spiritual gifts and graces, —humility, faith, zeal, love, devotion, heavenly-mindedness, tenderness, gentleness, self-sacrifice, forbearance towards others,[1]

[1] The lesson of meekness and forbearance was the one which the Bishop always seemed most anxious to put before his spiritual children. One of these writes: "He one day said to me that he so often remarked that the meek seem to be always giving up everything, and yet they win everything; 'The meek have the world at their feet.' I asked him if he had always been humble; and I can

watchfulness over self; and Satan is ever at your side to rob you of such of these as you possess, to lower your tone, to instil worldly motives and feelings, to undermine God's work in your own souls, to prevent the Spirit working His perfect work within you. I have thought in what way I could best help you in your work and service of love, and in your own souls also. As you are my fellow-helpers amid the flock which the Holy Ghost has committed to my care, so would I be your servant for Christ's Sake, ministering to you as I may be able, praying for you daily, and fulfilling as far as may be the office of your Father in Christ. In the discharge of this my duty I have, chiefly from other sources—availing myself of the experience of those who have been long engaged in works of mercy and of love—gathered certain counsels or suggestions for the advancement as well of your own spiritual life as of the work in which you will engage, which I now set before you."

The Inner Rule of Life, which the Bishop proceeded to give the Sisterhood of S. George's, though of course containing nothing new, will be interesting to many, as a specimen of Bishop Gray's more intimate teaching, as well as valuable in its suggestions to all who are seeking to make their own lives more interior.

"RULE I. Do all for God alone—all for the increase of His Glory, and from love to Him. Strive ever to realise His Presence,—to feel that all you do is done in His Sight. Look up to God even more than into yourselves. Dwell upon Him, upon His love to you, more than upon your own shortcomings or sins.

never forget the quick earnest way with which he replied, 'My dear, I have never been humble in my life!' When he was being told of the wrong-doing of others, his manner was not to be forgotten. When it was of importance that he should listen, I can see him now, his eyes fixed, a soft expression of sorrow on his face, combined with an anxious look, as if he were trying to take it in, and a prolonged and wonderfully gentle 'Ah!' which seemed to come from the very bottom of his heart. If I alluded unnecessarily to faults in others, or spoke impatiently of them, he would take my hand in his and say, 'We must remember, my child, that we have this treasure in earthen vessels.' This was quite one of his sayings; he spoke as if it were one of his most settled experiences."

"II. Keep ever before yourselves the life and example of Jesus Christ, as the best way of enabling you to live the life to which you devote yourselves. Remember that He came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and would have us walk in His Steps.

"III. The object of this household being to undertake active duties in the Vineyard of the Lord, the time for common prayer will be comparatively short; cultivate, therefore, a habit of retiring within yourselves while going from one duty to another. Lift up your hearts to God in earnest ejaculations, unnoticed and unknown. Thus shall ye obtain that spirit of recollectedness and watchfulness so necessary for all; but especially for those who are engaged in directly spiritual work.

"IV. Do not be content with hearing or reading the Daily Lessons, as appointed by the Church, but use and read a portion of Holy Scripture every day for close meditation and devotion, remembering that it is the very voice of God speaking to your soul, and not to be set aside for any devotional books, however conducive they may be to piety.

"V. At the daily hour allotted for prayer and devotional reading be most exact in your use of the time. Strive to make every time of prayer a time of real communion between your soul and God, avoiding all formality and idle wanderings.

"VI. Never go to Holy Communion without having examined yourself with care, and sought for a lively contrition, and determined to correct yourself; and always with an earnest and sincere purpose of heart.

"VII. Remember that the tendency of all human works, and of all associations formed with a view to promote God's highest glory, is to degenerate—that Satan is ever nigh at hand to mar your work, and to defeat the objects of this Association, and that ordinarily he will strive to effect this in and through you —through your faults, shortcomings, infirmities, sins.

"VIII. Aim therefore earnestly and unceasingly to love one another for Christ's Sake, as sisters engaged in one common work for Him Who died for you. Remember Who it is that has said that if we love not one the other, the love of God is

not in us. In proportion as your love one towards another for God's Sake shall grow, so will your love for Him increase. It was said of the first company of the faithful, 'See how these Christians love one another;' and of every community it should be possible to say, 'See how they love one another—they have but one heart and one mind.' Where the opposite spirit reigns, there is the abode of sin—a family under the influence of the Evil One; there then will exist weariness of the work, and hate of the daily life. Strive then to grow in love towards each other; nothing will tend more to your spiritual progress, and the Lord will abundantly reward whatever you do for love's sake.

"IX. Strive to be divested of self-will and selfishness, and to be conformed to the Will of Jesus only. Be ready to make any personal sacrifice for the sake of peace.

"X. 'Be ye all of one mind, having compassion one of another; love as brethren, be pitiful, be courteous, not rendering evil for evil, or railing for railing, but contrariwise blessing.' 'Likewise, ye younger, submit yourselves unto the elder; yea, all of you be subject one to another, and be clothed with humility.'

"XI. Be not betrayed into speaking of the faults of others, even in confidence.

"XII. Do not make mortifying remarks. Never, I entreat you, say or do anything that may wound another; but if one offends another accidentally, or through want of watchfulness, let the offender make such amends as charity and humility dictate. Let the offended seek to forgive instantly, and to pray at once for the offender. Do not go to one another for sympathy under these trials, but go straight to God, and lay your burden at His Feet.

"XIII. Strive to be full of kindness and tenderness towards each other. Always close your heart to unjust suspicions, malicious interpretations, unkind thoughts, and rash judgments. Put the best and most charitable construction on each other's acts and words.

"XIV. Should you be unjustly accused, directly or indi-

rectly, do not seek hastily to justify yourself, but remember how your Lord bore all manner of false accusations—yea revilings, for your sake, and answer not again.

" XV. Avoid studiously all partisanships, plottings, and undue distinctions, or favouritisms, as such things are sure sources of discord and loss of charity.

" XVI. Be very careful to preserve a quiet, calm, sober manner, in all you do or say at home or abroad.

" XVII. Always support one another's authority, and never express in the presence of a stranger, or servant, an unfavourable opinion of a Sister's order, or of her way of doing things.

" XVIII. If you should be called on, in the performance of your duty, to reprove another, urge the obligation of the Rule, rather than as expressing your own judgment, or wishes, or views, carefully avoiding all self-assertion.

" XIX. Pray for the Superior constantly, that God will be pleased to give her all needful graces and gifts for the office which she is appointed to fill. Seek to honour her for her office' sake, and always address her with respect. Never murmur or complain of her, or discuss her actions or motives. Be honestly and truthfully open with her; and yet be very careful that you take no complaint to her of others, unless you are well assured that it is your duty to do so, and that you do it, not from any private feeling of your own, but for the Glory of God and the wellbeing of the Association. Bear in mind that it is her duty to see that the Rules of the House are obeyed. Receive any remarks she may have to make as to neglect on this point with meekness and gentleness, remembering that her office is delegated to her by the Bishop, and that she represents him.

" XX. Let the Superior guard against any undue assumption of authority—any stretching of her powers beyond the true meaning and spirit of the Rules. Let her strive, for Christ's Sake, to be the servant of all, to bear the burdens of all, to treat all with equal love and tenderness, to comfort others by her counsels, to encourage them by her example, to be a pattern for them to follow, and in gentleness and

charity to bear with the infirmities of others, not lending a ready ear to complaints as to the faults or shortcomings of those who are ever to be regarded by her as dear Sisters in Christ.

"XXI. Those working at branch houses must pay due deference to the Sister in charge, bearing in mind that she represents the Superior.

"XXII. Lastly, 'Give diligence to make your calling and election sure; for, if ye do these things, ye shall never fall; for so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting Kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ;' 'Whom, having not seen, ye love; in Whom, though now ye see Him not, yet, believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory; receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls.'

"To Him be all the glory, both now and for ever. Amen."

From this time to the end of his life the care of the Sisters was one of the Bishop's most earnestly fulfilled duties. He superintended all their arrangements and doings, temporal and spiritual, taught them, watched over them individually, helping, checking, restraining, encouraging, praising, rebuking, as need might be—though, in truth, he was always found more ready to bestow commendation than reproof when possible. He was confessor and director to all; and those who enjoyed this privilege look back with untold gratitude to God for having given them the blessing of such tender wise guidance. The Bishop did not lay down a precise rule for his Sisters as to the frequency of their confessions, leaving it rather to the individual wants of each; but he was very far from discouraging them from seeking that spiritual help periodically and frequently, and was ever ready to hear them patiently and attentively. Perhaps some few passages from letters to the Sisters may tend to show the power he had of turning his mind to more detailed spiritual dealings, as well as to the wider fields of controversy. Unfortunately the supply of his spiritual counsels in writing is comparatively small, from the fact that as he was continually seeing

the Sisters—(not unfrequently, several times in the week)—there was but little occasion for writing, and his instructions were generally verbal. The few letters he wrote on such subjects are greatly valued by those to whom they were written, and they have kindly allowed the following extracts to be given.

"George, May 3rd, 1869.

"My dear Child—I have only just received your note with a mass of other documents requiring attention, and have only a few moments to reply, as we have very much yet to do in this place, and start on horseback at daybreak to-morrow. I do not think you are bound to know anything of ——'s private opinions on the subject of confession, or if you do know them, to tell her yours. Least of all are you under any obligation to tell her what steps you adopt for the discipline or comfort of your own soul. . . . I am of opinion that if any one were to ask you what your *practice* is with regard to confession, the question would be an impertinent one, and that the questioner would deserve a snub. I see no reason why the question as to the desirableness of confession should not be privately discussed among Christians; but I would rather that what is done in the Home should not be made a subject of discussion. If you *wish* to speak to ——, of course the case is different. I have no objection, nor do I object to your telling her that you come to me. You know my views on the subject. They are precisely those which, I believe, the Prayer-book inculcates. If you speak about it, do not get excited, and decline argument. Speak simply of the comfort and support you find in the practice. . . . I have great faith in the quiet earnest spirit disarming prejudice, by a simple statement as to spiritual good received. . . . Very affectionately yours, R. Capetown."

To a Member of S. George's Home.

"My dear Child—I have just received your letter giving an account of your disobedience and wrong temper and repentance. There was, of course, a want of watchfulness, or the enemy would not have got an advantage. If the outbreak is

not exaggerated by your vehement self-denunciation, as I half suspect, there ought to have been self-chastisement, and I doubt not that there was. . . . Satisfaction will come through future self-discipline and penitential deeds. I quite think with you that as your sin was self-indulgence, so now to overcome it you must in every way deny yourself. Act this rule out, and you will render satisfaction to God, and recover grace and strength, and altogether defeat Satan, who has got an advantage over you. . . . Remember that what God most looks for is your turning entirely to Him with loathing abhorrence of your sin, and with a lasting repentance. He does not wish to see you suffer more than is needful. The father did not expel the returning prodigal from his home—the son would be as the hired servant; and, doubtless, it will be yours to live as a servant of all, secretly humbling yourself in a thousand little ways, and unworthy of the same privileges and indulgences as others. Much of this must be self-imposed. It *is* one of the heaviest punishments of sin that we often cannot, as you say, 'undo any part of it.' . . . It does not follow that to heap severe penances upon you, which would reach others also, would be the right thing. The punishment you must endure must be to a great degree mental, and perhaps that is the best for you. Outward penances are good, but so deceitful is the heart, that sometimes it will find pleasure in substituting these for the finer and deeper sufferings of the spirit. . . . Believe me ever, my dear child, your father in Christ, R. CAPETOWN."

To a MEMBER of S. GEORGE'S HOME.

"My dear Child—I did not know that you were out of temper, nor can I quite understand the state of mind which causes you so much trouble and sorrow. One has his trials in this direction, another in a different one. I am very sorry for you, and quite forgive anything you may have said. . . . If you sin greatly in the way of temper, I also do in that and in other worse ways; therefore, instead of being vexed with you, I ought and I trust that I do sympathise.—Ever affectionately yours, R. CAPETOWN."

To ——.

"Bishop's Court, May 16th, 1871.

"My dear Child—You cannot unsay what you have once said. The words spoken remain. But they may be, and I trust are, blotted out of the book of God's remembrance. If you have repented, they are forgiven. The Blood of Jesus Christ washes clean from every sin. He has borne the punishment. You have gone to your Father, and, I hope, with real contrition pleaded the One Sacrifice. You have done so in private prayer; you have done so at the altar; you have sought and received absolution,—there can be no doubt of complete forgiveness if there has been complete repentance. The only thing I think you need be anxious about is the depth and reality of your godly sorrow. Make sure of that, and you ought to have peace, for the Blood of Christ has been applied to you in His holy Sacraments. . . . I think I should make that day year by year a day of special humiliation and confession before God. I should mention the sin continually in prayer with compunction, say more especially on the day of the week in which it was committed. Try also to dwell upon the thought that God is Love,—that He has sought and found you in spite of all your grievous sins; that He must love you with a deeper love than before, now that you have turned with all your heart to Him; and take heed that you watch very anxiously over yourself. If you do not now lose your hold upon God, if you can feel that you are earnestly striving to bring your whole self into entire conformity with His Will, you must not be cast down. Your Father's love and care will bring you safe home at last.—Ever truly yours,

"R. Capetown."

"*P.S.*—Of course you will tell God how you mourn over what you said, and wish you could unsay it, and beseech Him to regard the words as never spoken. If it will be any comfort to you, you may say what you like on the matter at your next confession."

To a MEMBER of S. GEORGE'S HOME.

"My dear Child—I can see you, D.V., on Friday, and shall be quite ready to receive you. . . . I understand what you say about your difficulties. Your yearnings and longings for those from whom you are separated are not unnatural. If thoughts of them came at Holy Communion between you and your Lord, so as to take your thoughts away from Him, they cannot be right. Whether they be temptations from without, or weaknesses from within, they must be resisted and prayed against as any other thing that is wrong.—I have no time for more at present."

To ——.

"My dear Child . . . I am glad that you can speak of your life at the Home as you do. My impression is that since you have got rid of the great burden upon your conscience you have grown in things spiritual. The deep past sins will haunt you yet, and Satan is ever, as you well know, on the watch to regain lost power. You have, by God's Grace, beat him once, and I hope effectually. Watchfulness and prayer will free you entirely from his toils. . . . I have been reading to-day page 58 of Mr. Carter's *Spiritual Instructions on Holy Communion.* I think that there are passages there which would be a help to you. It is a deeply spiritual book."

To ——.

"My dear ——, You will do much better to refer the question as to how often you should go to confession to your own confessor than to me. I think it is a little bit of pride which makes you ask me rather than him. . . . The person who is dealing with your soul must know best how often you will be the better for the discipline. To some it is a great help to be frequent in confession, especially in conquering a special sin. Only don't leave it to chance, or you are very likely to shirk, and go longer without it than is wise or safe. At least that is what some people would do. I do not say necessarily it would be so with you. . . . I suppose the more

one knows one's own heart, the more pitiful one can be for others; but it is not true kindness to keep them from pain and shame which is to save their souls."

To the Same.

"My dear ——, Don't be misled by that pitiful cry that only great sinners need use confession. It has lost many a soul. My dear ——, are you not, am not I, are not all of us great sinners? Do not we all need to be cleansed in the Precious Blood of Jesus Christ? Satan tries to delude men by telling them that only great sinners need it. It is a lie of his. Seek to use confession meekly and humbly, and not expecting to conquer your faults in a day. Be patient; it is very hard to go on having to tell the same faults so often, but the hardness and shame will help you, and God's Grace always comes in slow measures—at least generally it is so. If I can help you by writing to —— or ——, I will do so, but I think you should go simply and boldly and ask him to hear your confession. No good Priest would refuse, and the more simply all these things are done the better."

To a Member of S. George's Home.

. . . "Check the first thought of anger as the temptation comes in; when once it is in, it is often impossible to stop it. I have realised often myself how necessary it is to stop oneself at once. In the second stage of temptation sin comes in like a flood, and it is impossible to stop it or shut it out. That anger which rises in an instant against a slight shows what pride there is in the heart. Those sins of temper, this impatience, arise in a great measure from a want of humility. If pride could be conquered, you would to a great extent get rid of irritability, for does it not all come from thinking highly of oneself, and resenting being thwarted? You must try to look upon yourself as no one of importance, and then you will cease to be angry when things cross your will."

. . . "Conceit does not always show itself in deliberately

vain conceited thoughts. You would shrink with disgust from an actual vain thought, but your mind is not therefore free from conceit. Asserting your own opinion in everything, and persisting in it, as if you could not be wrong,—all this must have its origin in the thoughts, though it may be they were swift as lightning, and not dwelt upon. The grace of humility is the most beautiful you can possess; but you need not necessarily always think yourself worse than others. It is impossible for you not to know that others do things which you would not do on any account. S. Paul even, who calls himself the chief of sinners, must have known this. To attain humility we should not think of others at all, but should dwell on our own shortcomings; look more deeply into our own hearts, and consider how far we come short of our own great means of grace. So shall you obtain the grace you desire. Try especially to avoid self-complacent thoughts; they are a great snare to those whose work is praised by other people; they, more than others, should strive against self-complacency."

. . . "Take this as your motto—'Watch unto prayer.' Watching alone won't do it. Prayer alone won't do it. We must watch AND pray. Our Lord puts watching before prayer; it is sometimes more needful. Make the most of such occasions as arise in your spiritual reading for ejaculatory prayer. Whenever your soul is at all drawn to God, lift it up in a fervent ejaculation. It is by diligent use of ejaculatory prayer you must win back the lost spirit of devotion. Beseech God with earnest supplication that He will vouchsafe to give back to you the spirit of prayer. This is in some measure a hiding away of His Face. Look upon it as a punishment for that irritability and impatience of temper. Put yourself into our Lord's Hands. Dedicate yourself afresh to Him. Offer yourself anew to Him, and entreat Him that He would save you from yourself. . . . It is only by increased holiness that we come to know ourselves, and be exact in self-examination."

"You are not to think that there is no harm in repeating foolish things others may have done because they are true.

When any one through weakness or want of judgment does a thing which lays him open to ridicule, you are not to spread the evil, though it is his own fault. Every time you repeat it, it becomes a sin in you, and helps to increase the harm done."

"You think that you are too happy? . . . I have before pointed out that what our Father looks for is the turning of the whole heart and soul in true penitence to Him. He will have mercy, and not sacrifice. I could have given you, as you know, far heavier penances had I thought it agreeable to God's will, or likely to do you good. But the returning prodigal, the woman taken in adultery, illustrate how our dear Lord would have penitents dealt with. . . . You ought always to be able to receive Holy Communion, however suddenly. . . . If you are in a state of mind in accordance with the last answer in the Catechism, that is sufficient preparation."

"Do not suppose that the taking vows will in itself change your nature; the old Adam will still be there, and will never be quite rooted out till the end."

. . . "There may be too much of hearty or even boisterous mirth in your hours of relaxation; but I think this is better than a forced and unnatural restraint, and a too demure demeanour. I like myself a cheerful natural manner far better than a subdued and artificial quietness. These outward aspects, however, change with years, and circumstances, and trials."

To a Priest.

"You say that you are not fit to be at the head of a Clergy house. Fitness will come, like other things, in time, if there be the single eye and the continual looking up to God for guidance. I would not have you consider your unfitness too much. Admit that you are unfit, and that you want experience and spirituality,—there you are, and you must make the best of it. Seek counsel of God at each step. Watch over your own besetting faults of temper and self-reliance, and do the best you can day by day as circumstances arise. You will feel

your power and your spirituality too grow under a system of self-discipline, and through the experience gained from continued action."

The Sisters of S. George's Home asked the Bishop to choose a motto for them, and after some consideration he chose "*Adoremus et laboremus,*" saying that it united what must be the two great objects of all religious communities—the Glory of God and the service of man—the two parts of Mary and Martha.

To the Bishop of Oxford the Metropolitan wrote soon after his arrival:

"Bishop's Court, December 3rd, 1868.

"My dear Bishop—I write you a line just to say that we have arrived here well, and find all dear to us well. I am delighted with all my ladies. They are all at work, and, I hope, happy; and live most lovingly and harmoniously together under Rule. They have received a cordial welcome, not only from Church people but from the community. They are at work at the Hospital, House of Correction, Schools, Mission work among heathen and Malays. We are about to establish a home or refuge, for which, at this moment, Churchmen and Dissenters are all canvassing the town most harmoniously together. They are all cheerful and contented with their temporary house, and say that they will be sorry to leave it. . . . Work is opening out enough for twenty women.

"The Duke of Buckingham has been again hindering our Church here greatly. A few days ago came in the first mail since we left. Not a word about the Mandate from any one; but a despatch to the Governor instructing him to report from time to time all vacant chaplaincies and grants in aid in *this* Diocese (*not* in Graham's Town) to the Duke, with any recommendations I may make. This little spiteful persecution is (1) In violation of the Royal instructions, which tell the Governor to present at once to me for institution any persons whom I may recommend to him; (2) In violation of the system which has been acted upon here during the twenty-one years of my

Episcopate; (3) Would make it impossible to work the Diocese through the delays which it would occasion; (4) Is at variance with the privileges of all other religious bodies receiving State aid—Romanists, Dutch, Wesleyans, Presbyterians. These are all entirely free and uncontrolled.

"I have talked freely over the course which I shall pursue with the Governor, to whom the Duke has assigned no reasons for his extraordinary conduct. I will not argue with or complain to the Duke. That seems to be of no avail. I shall send a memorial to the Prime Minister, and furnish Douglas with copies of the same, to be sent with letters from me to the Archbishop, Mr. Gladstone, and Lord Carnarvon, praying them to bring the matter before Parliament if Mr. Disraeli will not do me justice; also, if needful, stir up this country and Parliament, which will not be a party to such gross wrong. You know my friends prevented anything being done about the Natal persecution. Now all religious bodies seem grateful to me, and we were never so harmonious. I have already received formal visits from the Roman Catholic Bishop and his Chaplain, and from the Moderator and Actuarius of the Dutch Church. A leading Dutch minister some time since offered to move against the Duke's proceedings. . . . Poor dear Archdeacon Thomas left before my return. . . . All Rondebosch was in tears when he left. They have been most kind, delicate, and liberal. The parish has unanimously prayed me to appoint Badnall in his stead." . . .

The next mail brought sorrowful tidings of the venerable Primate's death, and, among other letters, one from Bishop Wilberforce, telling his friend of a heavy personal grief which had come upon him almost at the same time. The Bishop of Cape Town wrote in reply:

"Bishop's Court, December 17th, 1868.

"My dearest Bishop—I must write one line of deep and loving sympathy with you under this new and sore trial. . . . I know your heart will bleed. I have no comfort to give, for I hold that to forsake our Communion for that of Rome is a

great sin. When will the Church of England learn that she cannot retain her children if she will not claim her full heritage of the Faith, and act, in the exercise of discipline, whatever Courts may say or do, as the Bride of Christ? I feel sure that the last thing which has slain the —— is the tolerated infidelity of Voysey. If I were his Bishop, I would try and condemn him and place another in his room, and call on the faithful to receive him. If this had been done in Williams' case, we should have broken with the State, and have been persecuted; but thousands of true-hearted men would have rallied round the Church, and many now in Rome would never have left. Men lose all hope and confidence in the Church because of these things. I have had a mournful letter from poor ——. It is this loss of faith in the Church that is killing him.

"I fear that this defection may have cost the Church of England the only man who, as Primate, was fit to guide her amidst the perils which surround her. God forgive them, and preserve you yet to vindicate and uphold the truth. Hereafter, it may be, you will see how all these sorrows were needed by you. Had all been prosperous, you might, in your position, have been wrecked yourself.—Believe me ever, my dear Bishop, your loving sympathising brother, R. CAPETOWN."

The Bishop's letters at this time naturally dwelt on the anxiety felt through the English Communion as to the successor to Archbishop Longley. He was troubled, too, at the continued silence of Government as to the Mandate, and his home cares were considerable, owing to the condition of his Clergy—two dead, one dying; three, including his valuable Dean and Archdeacon Thomas, gone; another leaving, and several absent. The bright spot was his Sisterhood. "I feel," he wrote to Miss Cole (December 16th, 1868), "that they are loyal and dutiful daughters. I am in treaty for a property near the Cathedral, which will give us room for enlargement. If we purchase it, we shall begin a Refuge there at once, and have class-rooms. These are already greatly needed, for the poor claim the Sisters for their own, and come a great deal to them.

Miss Fair makes an excellent Superior. She is very gentle, sensible, and good. Remember that we want more ladies. Any that you can recommend can come at any time. In point of fact, all feel how impossible it is with our present staff to grapple with a quarter of the work in Cape Town, with its 8,000 Mahometans and 8,000 heathen. The poverty just now is very great. I think that the inhabitants have raised near £300 to begin the Refuge. Clearly before long we must do something for female education, and for this I am inclined to look to Clewer." . . .

"We have not got half settled yet," the Bishop wrote, January 1st, 1869, "and the Bishops will be here for the consecration and Provincial Synod within a fortnight." They came as expected; *i.e.* the Bishops of Graham's Town, S. Helena, and Free State; and on January 25th, the Conversion of S. Paul, the consecration took place,—a crowded congregation assisting at a ceremony so long and so greatly desired by the faithful in Africa. It was a bright hearty service:—the Bishop of Graham's Town preached, and a large number of persons communicated with the new Bishop. The Bishop writes to Mr. Douglas, February 3rd, 1869: "It is due to you, both as a dear friend and as one of the secretaries of my Association, that I should announce to you the consecration of Bishop Macrorie. It took place on Sunday last, the Feast of the Conversion of S. Paul, in the Cathedral Church of Cape Town. . . . I need not tell you at what cost and inconvenience the Bishops came together. . . . At least I trust that the world will believe that we are in earnest, and that we will not compromise the Honour or the Truth of our Lord, or the character of this branch of the Church as a true witness for Christ, whatever the consequences may be. The consecration excited the very deepest interest: Churchmen came in from a great distance; the Cathedral was crammed, many had to go away. The communicants were very numerous—offertory, £78. Yesterday, being the Feast of the Purification, we had a parting service before our dear brother departed for his trying field of labour. Though the notice was short, we had a good congregation, and nearly 100 com-

municants. He left us calm, collected, gentle as ever, quietly resolved, conscious that he has a cross to bear. People here took greatly to him during the short time that he was with us; they were especially pleased with his preaching. . . . Very many here believe that what is really at stake is Christianity as a revelation from God; and whatever perplexities may surround this question, they believe that the step we have taken was needed, and that it is a right one in the sight of God. We must follow our Brother with our prayers. He will greatly need and value them. . . . We have all felt exceeding comfort, though sorrowing for Colenso, because we believe, without a shadow of doubt, that we have done what God would have us do."

The Bishop of Oxford wrote, on hearing of the consecration:

"Windsor Castle, March 22nd, 1869.

"My dearest Brother—I have received your most welcome letter, cheering in every way. I cannot help believing that all has been even manifestly overruled for the good of Christ's Church in this matter. If we had with much difficulty and opposition managed the consecration here, there would have remained questions and difficulties which are all solved at once by the manful and unquestioned exercise of your own power out in the Colony. May God bless the great event, and order the future so that truth and peace may be indeed secured." . . .

"Our consecration was most successful," the Metropolitan wrote, February 3rd, 1869. "The service made an impression. We had Processionals and Recessionals for the first time. The opposition of unbelievers, State-and-Church men, and Evangelicals, all of whom club together on these occasions, was of the feeblest kind. The interest excited here has been very great. Bishop Macrorie sailed yesterday in good heart. He is very quiet and gentle, but, I believe, full of faith. Our people took greatly to him, and they liked his preaching. He is greatly calculated to win. He will probably meet with both opposition and insult from Colenso's supporters in Natal, but this

will do no harm. He had a cordial welcome here, and carried off £200 in his pocket, of which nearly £100 was given here. I do not expect that I have done with Natal troubles, but we are all greatly relieved in mind—the deed is done, and we are thankful. Graham's Town is gone, S. Helena returns to-morrow; Free State in his wagon across the Karroo on Monday. He has had 1,800 miles in an African summer over an African desert. I hope the world will believe that we mean what we say, and that we have convictions. All the Dutch ministers and others came to church, to show that they were of one heart with us in the matter. The Church only needs to show a good front to the world to gain a victory. Men believe that we have no convictions. When Bishops come by land and sea, through storms and over deserts, to do a deed like this, at great cost and personal sacrifice, they preach very effectually. I am sure that our people have learnt a great deal by this consecration. Macrorie's preaching is telling; on board ship all seem to have been greatly attached to him. We had a parting service in the Cathedral, on the Feast of the Purification, at which, with scarce any notice, there were near 100 communicants."

The Synod also had been satisfactory:—"We worked at our subjects in Conference or in Synod every day from 10 to 5. We have, I hope, taken a great step towards the more complete organisation of the Church in these parts. Our conclusions were always unanimous.

"Sophy is knocked up by her labours as clerk during our Synod. Louisa's health makes us anxious."

Early in March the Bishop and Mrs. Gray started on a Visitation. From Beaufort the Bishop wrote—

"March 31st.

"We are now at what used to be the Ultima Thule of the Visitation, but this time I go beyond a giro of 350 miles, to Frazerburg, Schiet-fontein, and Victoria, returning here in about three weeks' time. . . . I find the work generally sluggish in the Diocese. The seven years of drought and poverty have

dispirited all. I am afraid that I am getting, myself, too old and worn to throw much new life into the system."

And he wrote to his sister from

"Ondtshoarn, April 24th, 1869.

"Sophy and I have been out nearly seven weeks, during which we have traversed a very rough part of the Diocese, and visited localities which I have never been able to reach before. We have been nearly five weeks in the Karroo. I hope to reach home some time in June, when the rains will have set in. It would occupy full six months to traverse my whole Diocese, and there are still parts of it which, after twenty-two years of incessant travelling, I have never been able to reach. As years creep on (and I am close upon sixty), I feel the fatigue of these somewhat exhausting journeys, and should rejoice to get another Diocese lopped off; but it would take £7,000 to effect this, and whence is the money to come from? . . . You would have been moved to see how the coloured people clustered round me at Frazerburg, a village created within the last twelve years, and whence I had never been before. Several prayed to be prepared for Holy Baptism—all asked for a school. They have undertaken to build a school chapel, I giving them wood and iron and glass. Here, at this place, I am asked to take up three new stations. Work opens out everywhere, and I find it very difficult not to take it up, and yet in doing so, I cripple, and even risk the maintenance of posts already occupied. This year the Voluntary principle will probably be adopted by our Parliament, and S. P.G. threatens me with a further reduction. . . . Sophy is much better, though not yet strong. The long days often knock her up. We have lived half our time of late in the open air, taking most of our meals during outspan, and have had enough of daily picnics!"

To the Right Hon. JOHN MOWBRAY, M.P.

"April 24th, 1869.

The atmosphere of the House of Commons is not a

healthy one for any man. I do not feel it necessary to reply to his Grace of Buckingham. He insinuates untruths, however, if he does not state them, and he implicates Dizzy, for *he* told me that the matter about the mandate was not before him, whereas the Duke says it had been submitted to him, some time before I saw him, in writing. I did receive letters from him, but not upon the point—the mandate—and the simple fact of which I complain, he admits, viz., that in May he invited the Archbishop to apply for a mandate, and that he let me leave in October, and the Archbishop die in November, without either letting him or me know what he meant to do, though we both repeatedly asked for a decision, and the Archbishop told me before I left that he was as much hurt as myself at the treatment of the Duke. Well, they are gone. As to Gladstone, his great sin is proposing a measure involving robbery and sacrilege. I cannot get over that, but I confess that if his proposals as to property were fairer, I should submit to his disestablishment plan (which is admirable) very complacently. I do not believe that the Church of England, in its present relations with the State, can continue long truly to witness to Christ. I have publicly said these fifteen years that if she did not destroy her final Court of Appeal, it would destroy her. It will, I am sure, be a chief element in the overthrow of her as an Establishment, because her most devoted sons feel that it represents not the Church but the world, and as such must be antagonistic to the Faith. Gladstone's scheme simply invites the Church in Ireland to do what the Colonial Churches have already done. I suppose that he has proposed harder terms than he expects to carry, leaving it to Conservatives in the House of Lords to demand better. His proposal to give the Church nothing, but only to respect the vested life interests of her present ministers, while he gives the Romanists fourteen years' purchase, is monstrous, especially as he spoke last year of its retaining three-fifths of its income. Let him give the Church £8,000,000, and content himself with stealing the other eight, and I shall be satisfied. The Irish Church would then only have to carry out into practice the

Reports of the Lambeth Conference as to Synods and Court of Appeal, and it would be safe, and probably a new life would be infused into it, if it did not rush into Protestant extremes. If it would take up true Catholic grounds, it would gain upon Rome daily. If Protestantism is to be its watchword, it will die out in half a century."

The sort of kindly watchfulness exercised by the Bishop over his little community at Cape Town may be seen by the following letter, written during this Visitation.

To Miss Fair.

"Beaufort, March 30th, 1869.

"I must write you a few lines before I plunge deeper into the Karroo, if only to express my satisfaction at hearing that you are all good children, and going on as well as could be expected without the benefit of my snubs. I have, however, a further satisfaction in giving you an extract from a letter lately received from Bishop Tozer. It will tend, I trust, to keep you humble. At all events it will give you an insight into the character of our private communications when we write to each other about our special difficulties. 'I shall watch,' he says, 'with great interest the experiment you are making of a *quasi* Sisterhood. I don't, as you know, pretend to have any deep acquaintance with the lady portion of the world, but if there ever were a project from which I should shrink back with almost instinctive terror, it is that of bringing over the wide Atlantic eight independent ladies, with any sort of hope that they will run comfortably in harness for any given period. If you succeed, as I trust you may, I think this will not be the least among your many and heroic feats, but I confess that your position on the barouche seat, even when I contemplate that dizzy eminence from so great a distance as Zanzibar, well nigh unnerves me.' Now have you quite sunk to the ground? You will not at least be surprised at my self-distrust as to management of ladies. Well, they are some of them not harder to manage than men! Joking apart, I am glad to hear that all is

going on tolerably well. You shall have my house at Kalk Bay, if any of you want a change.' . . . Best love to the dear Sisters. The blessing of the God of Peace be with you all.—Your affectionate father in Christ, R. CAPETOWN."

The next letters convey an account of one of those terrible fires from which the African Colonists so often suffer. The Bishop and Mrs. Gray wrote a joint letter to their son:

"Forest Hall, Plett Bay, May 11th, 1869

"My dearest boy—We are shut up here at Mr. Newdegate's by a rainy day. It is the one day of rest which we allowed ourselves during this Visitation, and we had meant to employ it in exploring some part of this beautiful country, but, instead of this, I am reading up and writing up. We came here yesterday through the blackened remains of the noble virgin forest, which was destroyed by the great fire which took place just before we left home. Newdegate had just finished a fine large house. Had his roof been thatched instead of covered with zinc, it would inevitably have been burnt down. So little is this district inhabited, that he is still surrounded by tigers and baboons. We had a very hard and hot week. On Sunday (while unwell) I had three sermons, 120 communicants, and an Ordination at George. On Monday a bustling day, and a great gathering at George, when presents were made to the Archdeacon and Mrs. Badnall on leaving, and an address to me. After a sleepless night we rode off at daybreak to Schoonberg,—horses very restive. We reached Schoonberg only just in time for me to change leather breeches and jack-boots for robes, and to rush into church. Next morning we were off again for Lyons (?), forty-five miles. Very hot, horses very tired, without water. Next day, Ascension Day, communion, confirmation, two services, evening meeting, and looking up of people all rest of day. Friday, over a new mountain pass to Avontown in Longkloof, and from thence over the new noble road to the Knysna and Plett Bay. We slept at the old Convict Station, and had a beautiful ride of eight hours on Saturday to Plett Bay, where I had bought a very nice house and valuable

piece of land for the Mission. Monday, long service, confirmation, and communion in morning. Then six miles' walk for afternoon service; back just in time for evening service at the Mission Chapel. Your mother stands her work well, but she gets rest whenever not actually travelling. We turn back towards the Cape to-morrow, D.V., riding a long day to the Knysna. Our horses have carried us very well. My last morning at George was spent in writing a reply to the Duke of Buckingham's statement and the *Times* article. I am so sick of controversy that I should have left it alone, had not Badnall thought that I should reply. Of course I confined myself to a correction of mis-statements as to certain facts. Luckily I had with me my book containing copies of my letters. It would have been better if I had also had the Colonial Office letters."

(Here Mrs. Gray takes up the letter.) "Knysna, May 14th. . . . Though I stand my work very well when out in the air, I feel very tired when I do sit down, and cannot collect my ideas to write letters. I was not well at George, where it was very hot, but after the first two days' riding it became cool and showery, and I have got on much better. The horses have stood their work better than usual, and are quite fresh and frisky, which makes it much easier. The one day that my horse got so tired I was very near giving in myself. The Knysna looks lovely as ever, though the fire has destroyed so much of it; but where it was only green veldt it is already green again, and there is only one small piece of burnt forest visible from here, and that is a good way off, and only when the light falls on it can one see that it is black. The village had the most wonderfully narrow escape. It was surrounded, all the tops of the hills on fire, and only the narrow flat between them and the lake left, and two miles of it burnt to the water's edge, when the wind suddenly changed and carried it all away. The Barringtons were all but safe, the fire having passed them when this change came, and in five minutes all was gone. We are going up there on Saturday to see them and condole, but it is very sad to see the forest where it is

really burnt out, as it is in many places, and I fear that beautiful Westford is one of the worst. Many people think that it was so hot and crisp that the trees might have taken fire by friction, but I am not disposed to believe that. The wind was a hurricane, and the least spark carried on it would light again, and quantities of bits of burning wood or fern flew for immense distances, so that in many places the burn is all in patches, some left green and surrounded by black patches. Mr. Newdegate lost 1,500 acres of his best forest. The birds dropped down smothered with smoke, and the poor little bucks were found with their little feet burnt off with running about among the hot ashes." . . .

The Bishop completes the account of the forest fire in a letter to Mr. Edward Gray:

"Mossel Bay, May 24th, 1869.

. . . "Having nothing to do on the Queen's birthday, I am able to write letters. We have reached this place in my Visitation, having been out nearly three months. We are not so weary as when we left George. It speaks well for our vigour to say that the 300 miles' ride freshened us up, but it is so. I never saw any more distressing inanimate sight than Darnell's property. Everything except the ground itself on a whole estate is destroyed. His magnificent forest is one black mass; a most beautiful spot has been utterly wasted. The whole country with very fine patches of forest up to Barrington's house has been destroyed. . . . Barrington's calmness is unruffled; be began to rebuild the day after the fire. We rode up to see him. The desolation over a vast region is great. . . .

"I watch the Irish Bill. If the money matter can be settled on fair terms, I shall not break my heart about disestablishment. I am telling the Governor that if our Voluntaries will deal with us as Gladstone does with Maynooth, I will support them. On my return home I must summon both Provincial and Diocesan Synod, then probably make another Visitation up the western coast. This long Visitation has satisfied me that I cannot work this whole Diocese efficiently. New

Missions need to be started in various directions, and it requires another and a fresh man to do this."

To the BISHOP of BOMBAY.

"Riversdale, May 27th, 1869.

"My dear Bishop—Your interesting letter reached me during my Visitation. . . . It is drawing to a close. We have this time been more to the north than on any former occasion—*e.g.*, to Frazerburg and Schiet-fontein—and have had an interesting but somewhat wearisome journey. The temporal condition of the country is very sad; no one has any money; men barter, not buy. Property is almost unsaleable. The Church work is generally prospering, and fresh demands come upon me from many quarters. I have taken up work at Frazerburg, on the sea-coast here and elsewhere. Walter's memory is tenderly cherished at Victoria. Had his life been spared he would have done a considerable work there. . . . Gething (?) is acceptable at Beaufort. . . . The whole Archdeaconry is mourning over the loss of Badnall; at every place they speak of him with the deepest affection. The change in George is very remarkable. . . . You would see dear Rattle's death; I hear of his work from old pupils in the country. . . . Your letter was very interesting to me. I shall always be glad to have information respecting the work to be done among your twelve million, and the prospects before you and your plans. You have a noble field. I fear that societies will do little for you. You must conceive your own designs, and throw yourself largely upon India for support."

The Bishop reached home, June 12th, to be immersed in fresh and pressing occupation, to which the gaps in his ecclesiastical staff added considerably. The health of his eldest daughter, Mrs. Glover, was also an anxiety. "Dearest Louisa does not get better; she seems very feeble," he wrote in his first letters from home. Archdeacon Glover was urged by the doctors to take his wife to England, and the Bishop wrote accordingly

To the Rev. the Hon. HENRY DOUGLAS.

"If I were in England I should be disposed to see whether I could not connect a Brotherhood with the Kafir College which Glover has to leave, who might take up Mission work among Mahometans, and education in Cape Town. I may yet write to Benson of Cowley about this."

In July 1872 the Bishop wrote again on the same subject. "I am really anxious to found a Brotherhood which might take up the Mahometan work, and train teachers for the Cape Town schools who might live at the Home with the brothers, and if —— resigns, as he proposes, might take charge of S. John's. The income arising from the church and schools would almost support them, and I think people would give. If I could find one really good man to begin with, I would let the work gradually grow up like the Sisterhood."

To the BISHOP of OXFORD.

"Bishop's Court, June 17th, 1869.

"I have just returned from a long Visitation over a portion of the Diocese. I cannot traverse the whole in less than six months, and I hope to live to see it divided. In spite of extreme poverty the Church is taking root in the land;—its position is far stronger than it was a few years ago. My chief reason for writing now is to say that my son-in-law Glover, who has been working in this Diocese most faithfully for sixteen years as Parish Priest, Warden of the Native College, and (by desire of the Archdeaconry of George) Badnall's successor in the office of Archdeacon, is constrained by the failing health of my child to return to England. I am very anxious to get him some useful post, and I am sure that you will, if you can, assist me. . . . The letters from Macrorie are most cheering. He is evidently winning his way. Palmer's and Coleridge's opinion ought to make the Archbishops feel ashamed of their insults to me. York has sent back my letter to him communicating Macrorie's consecration, and requesting him to communicate the fact to the Bishops of his Province. It has come to

me with 'Refused' on the outside!!! I am deeply grieved to see that the dear Bishop of Salisbury does not rally. I watch the Irish question with very deep interest. I do not care for the disestablishment, but no sophistry can justify spoliation, and this is spoliation. I think that we may live to see the Church of England disestablished. I am sure that our children will. Diamonds still continue to be found on our frontier, or beyond it, but the country does not rise in prosperity."

The Bishop watched, as he said, the Irish Church question with the keenest interest—repeatedly expressing himself as "rather thankful than otherwise" for disestablishment; but the matter of disendowment he thought unjust. "I am no more in love with Gladstone than I am with Dizzy," he wrote; "for I think he has simply spoiled the Irish Church, and dealt out great injustice to it." And again: "I hope the Irish Church may be disestablished with as little loss of endowment as possible. I cannot stand Gladstone's wholesale robbery. I should not break my heart if the Church of England were disestablished. If it were, and kept its property, it would soon cover the land."

To Mrs. Williamson.

"Bishop's Court, July 6th, 1869.

"My dearest Annie—I have not much to say, but I suppose you will be writing bitter things in your heart against me if I do not send you a line. Just now I am uneasy at not being able to get a successor in George Archdeaconry, or Warden at Zonnebloem. You will, I am sure, be pleased to hear that all at Natal is going on very well. In a late letter the Bishop says that all things are going on so smoothly that it makes him tremble; that he does not hear of any work being done by Colenso; that apparently if he had three or four more earnest men, and means to maintain them, he could carry everything before him. The world said 'Consecrate, and you will add immensely to the evils which now afflict Natal,—there will be a vast increase of bitterness, and controversy will be intensified.' The facts are that up to the period of the Bishop going

there all the papers were full of violent letters, that now there seems a perfect lull. The subject is scarcely ever alluded to. The Bishop's work is daily increasing. Colenso seems nowhere. It is, I believe, an answer to prayer, and the reward of faithfulness. Of course Satan is only foiled; he is not yet thoroughly defeated. The Synod of Graham's Town is now sitting; the Bishop of Maritzburg has called his for July 21st; mine is summoned for January 18th; the Provincial for January 31st. I suppose dearest Louisa will leave us in September. I shall feel her departure very much."

To ——.

"I think people ought to guard against the inclination to judge and disparage others: it is the sin of Churchmen in this day. Men give free scope to their opinions with regard to others, and to their tongues in expressing those opinions. It recoils upon those who yield to the temptation by injuring their own moral and spiritual state. —— in a late letter has fallen foul of the Bishop of Oxford; the Bishop of Lincoln (Wordsworth), whom I think one of the noblest men of the day; the Bishop of Lichfield (Selwyn), another really great man; and the Vicar of Leeds, with I know not how many more. . . . Why should we not rather thank God for giving us such very noble men as the Bishop of Lincoln? A Church seldom has many such men at one time in it. It is not a healthy state which leads the mind to dwell disparagingly on the weak points of a good man. In our day there is a tendency to denounce eminent men for points on which they may differ from us (and there ever must be some such points), rather than to be thankful for the marvellous real unity to be found among us in all essential truth. I think that the mind should be constrained to dwell on the good side of those around, especially of the Fathers of the Church, rather than the evil. I think that you wrong the Bishop of Oxford (Wilberforce) in speaking of his view of the Real Presence as *subjective*. He believes, if I mistake him not, in a real objective Presence in the elements, but only during the sacrament. That ended, the presence no

longer abides. That is very different from what I regard as the subjective view. Whether it is right or wrong is another matter." . . .

A most overwhelming sorrow came upon the Metropolitan at this time in connection with the Free State, which tried him almost more than any sorrow he had ever yet known; and Mrs. Gray had a severe illness also, which was in fact the beginning of her last illness, while the Bishop was also looking forward sadly to parting with his eldest daughter, whose health became increasingly frail. "As the time approaches for losing Louisa and Glover, I feel very sorry," he wrote. "I am just sixty, and very probably we shall not meet again. One of the most discouraging things in the Colonial Church is the continually dropping off of the best men, upon whom one has learned to lean. I have lost ten in a year."

In addition to all these troubles the Bishop was worried by the seemingly unfair decisions of the Courts about Church property in Natal. I had paid everything in Natal two years ago," he writes to his brother (September 3rd, 1869). "The utter unfairness of secular judges on all Church questions is wonderful. I, Robert Gray, bought or had given me by private individuals, or by Government in Natal, certain lands which I had vested in Robert Gray, Bishop of Cape Town, and his successors in the said See. Colenso calls upon me to appear before the Natal Courts to show cause why that Court should not declare that that property was vested in T. W. Colenso, Bishop of Natal, and his successors in that See. I appear and say that I know nothing except that it was acquired by me, and vested in myself. The Court by a majority,—Connor dissenting,—adjudge that it is vested in Colenso, and cast me in costs. The case there and here cost me £200 more or less. I appeal, (Connor strongly urged it, disgusted partly at costs being given when the Court was divided, which they had just before refused to give in another case on this ground). On reaching England I consult with many as to my duty. All say, It is your duty to carry out the Appeal. Sir R. Palmer said, It is

a clear case; the Council cannot decide against you. I advise you not to appeal on spiritual questions, for there is a current of opinion in such cases against ecclesiastical assumption of jurisdictions, but fight your battle on questions of property. These are plain cases, and you will have fair play. You see what justice one gets! They cannot say that the property is in Colenso, but they tell the very man who bought it and vested it in himself, that it is not his, and they make me pay the costs in a judgment which they upset! . . . No wonder that Churchmen think the less they have to do with the State and its Courts, the better chance they have of justice! Well, I trust this is the last that I shall ever have to do with them. It will take some time to get me out of debt, but expenses increase upon me. If I have to go to the State, it will cost me £200.

"September 15th.—The whole costs will be £700 more or less. I mean to pay this out of my private purse. . . I have some satisfaction in making this last sacrifice to save the temporalities of the Church, but I am indignant at the meanness and injustice in charging me with Dean Green's proceedings. . . . If I were not a worn-out man, I would tackle these judges, but I should only draw down, I suppose, more abuse, and I am content to let the matter alone. I have £1,000 given by the dear Kebles to be appropriated as I wish, and with reference to Natal, out of which I could pay these expenses, but I wish to keep that intact for some endowment 'in memoriam.' I feel that I am justified in giving it to my Diocese; Keble left it wholly to me to decide. I should like to have given it to my Chapter."

To Mrs. Williamson.

"September 10th, 1869.

"My ladies are now in their new house, and are charmed with it, as well they may be. It has cost altogether £2,000, and I have been obliged to keep half this on mortgage. I opened the Oratory on Wednesday with Holy Communion, a good number of Clergy being present. We have now six penitents, who are

going on very well. There are ten Sisters' bedrooms, a beautiful dormitory capable of holding twenty, capital penitents' dining and sitting rooms, wash-houses, yards, garden, all in the heart of the town, and within a stone's throw of the Cathedral. I want sadly some more Sisters, but I have hardly spirit or energy left for anything."

Shortly after this the Bishop started again on Visitation, Mrs. Gray as usual accompanying him, though now her health was very seriously failing, and one marvels how she could bear the great fatigue and discomforts of travelling. Nothing but her boundless devotion to her husband and his work, and a patient unselfish courage rarely met with, could have enabled her to go on. The Bishop was not at this time really uneasy about her. He writes to his son:

"Clanwilliam, October 9th, 1869.

"My dearest Charlie . . . We have been out nearly three weeks, travelling over the bays to this place. Your mother is not, I think, much better, and has suffered from the heat here; and I have not been well, but you know we are growing old. I speak of myself, now, as between sixty and seventy, having reached sixty last Sunday. The coloured work, through the greater part of the Malmesbury parish, is very encouraging. Belson works wonderfully well. . . . We go from here, by a great round, to the Cold Bokkeveld, to our Mission Station. Last time we rode the distance from this in a day and a half; —we shall now spend five days on the journey, because the Eland's Kloof Pass is impassable for a carriage. We are travelling this time in the Governor's *Spider*, an imported American carriage which he has lent us—very light, a mere skeleton. He went up to the Free State in it with two ponies; over the sands of the country we have traversed it is heavy work for four. . . . Poor Loui is, I am afraid, a frail little body. Glover's departure is universally regretted.

"From a letter of the Archbishop of Canterbury, to some persons in Natal, advising them to keep aloof from both parties, I learn that Colenso has petitioned the Queen against me.

Nothing will induce me again to go to law before the Judicial Committee of Privy Council. There is no justice to be obtained by the Church from secular Courts; they are entirely governed by their prejudices and popular opinion. We shall probably have, in our Provincial Synod, to protest against the act of the Archbishop of Canterbury for—

"I. Interfering uncanonically in the affairs of this Province, with which he has no connection ecclesiastically or legally.

"II. Assuming a *quasi* universal Episcopate over our Communion.

"III. Defying the judgment of his own Provincial Synod, which, he alone dissenting, declared Colenso canonically deposed.

"IV. Apparently encouraging our people not to hold communion with us.

"There seems to be no real end of our troubles and trials.—Ever, my dearest boy, your affectionate father,

"R. CAPETOWN."

To Mrs. MOWBRAY.

"Clanwilliam, October 9th, 1869.

. . . "I ought to go on to Namaqua Land, 250 miles farther, over a desolate land where in parts there is no water, or houses, or forage, but neither I nor Sophy are quite up to it, nor our horses, and I have to return to prepare for my two Synods, and other anxious work. The Archbishop of Canterbury has been writing one of his wrongheaded letters to some people in Natal, really meant to uphold Colenso and induce people to keep aloof from Bishop Macrorie. . . . He little knows how much these escapades are helping forward the disestablishment of the Church of England. A disestablished Archbishop would know his own position in the Church, which he clearly does not, but, in consequence of his worldly position, esteems himself '*alterius orbis Papa*.' . . . I am glad to see that John is going to speak at the Liverpool Congress. We seem going, in the political world, at a railroad pace into revolution. You will probably live to see the Church of England dis-

established, if at sixty I do not. I do not myself see how, in the present state of things she can continue truly to witness for Christ while established; and as I believe that there is yet a great career before her, and that God has a great work for her, if untrammelled, to do in the world, I look complacently at the progress of events."

A letter written from Clanwilliam at this time gives a very clear account of the Bishop's work.

To the Rev. the Hon. HENRY DOUGLAS.

"October 8th, 1869.

. . . "The work in my Diocese is continually growing . . . the poverty of the country very great. The chief difficulty of our work consists in this, that the Dutch own the land, and that our English population is everywhere, but always in small numbers; while over a great part of the country the heathen, who outnumber Europeans, are uncared for. We have at present 45 Clergy, 30 Catechists, about 100 schools, chiefly mission. Nearly everywhere progress is made. Last week, in one parish (Malmesbury), I confirmed full 150 coloured people, and had 250 Communicants at several stations. Scarce a day passes without applications from one quarter or another for extension of the work, while I am paying for that already established, at the rate of £300 a year beyond any known source of income. Nearly the whole country to the north of this, where we are continually engaged in a war of extermination with Corannas and Bushmen, is uncared for. On arriving at this village, which is one of the most desolate and outlying portions of my Diocese, I received by one post three applications for help. . . . I have unceasing applications of a similar character from every part of South Africa."

To the Rev. CHARLES N. GRAY.

"Bishop's Court, November 2nd, 1869.

. . . "We have just got back from my second Visitation, which occupied just the time that the Glovers' voyage would

consume. Your mother is not the better for her journey, but she is not worse. She is again under Ebden. I hope there is nothing serious, but her complaint has not given way to medicine. This keeps her weak, and in some pain; she cannot ride, or walk much. The Visitation was fairly satisfactory. I am sending an account of it to Bullock, who is publishing part of my last Visitation Journal in the Mission Field. Having had seven years of drought, followed in the beginning of the year by terribly destructive fires, we have last week had fearful floods which have devastated large portions of the country. At Beaufort the damage arising from the bursting of the dam or lake is rated at £60,000. About twenty chief houses are washed away; our church, school, parsonage, safe. The flood came right against the school, a nice stone building; while the mission chapel farther off fell at once, it withstood the shock. In some places the rivers rose and carried off crops, land, persons, horses, oxen, pigs, etc. We are an afflicted country, as regards spiritual and temporal things."

To the Same.

"Bishop's Court, December 1st, 1869.

. . . "What wonderful questions on Church and State are being discussed all over the world! If Rome believed a General Council to be what Constance believed it to be, I should have greater hope of the future, as regards the Church, than I can now have. I cannot understand this rush into Ultramontanism, and this development of Mariolatry. Rome, such as Ultramontanes would make it, cannot (as it seems to me) be the Church which shall lift up the standard of the Lord against the coming Antichrist. She drives would-be believers into infidelity. Her position and yearnings are to me incomprehensible. In England, clearly and very rapidly the State is throwing off not the Church only but Christianity also. I fear that you will have a purely secular State education, which a few years ago I thought an impossibility; and that this will swallow up gradually our whole existing system. The way in which the mind of the nation seems inclined to

rush into looseness is very alarming. Your mother does not throw off her complaint, and it keeps her weak, so that she cannot take much exercise. She has not, however, lost flesh, and her doctor has not been to her for a week. I am hard at work at Canons. I have hardly done anything else since I came home. I work all the week, and discuss, every Monday, for a day the Canons I have framed with the Dean, Archdeacon Ogilvie, and Chancellor Barrow, delegate from Graham's Town. These, with charges and addresses and matter for the Diocesan Synod, will keep me going till January 18th, when the Diocesan Synod meets."

To JOHN MOWBRAY, Esq., M.P.

"We are just discussing the very questions the Irish Church is discussing. The real difficulty is the precise position of the laity. If they occupy in our reformed Churches a position in accordance with Scripture and primitive antiquity, we shall, I think, be the centre round which Christianity will gather. If they grasp a power, or are allowed to do so, beyond this, Rome will ride roughshod over prostrate Churches. I rely upon Trench more than upon any other man in Ireland."

Mrs. Gray's health was meanwhile certainly failing more and more, though the Bishop hardly allowed himself to think her worse. "Sophy continues much the same," he wrote November 13th, 1869, to his sister. "She cannot take much exercise, and lies down a good deal. Dr. Ebden does not, however, seem at all anxious about her. . . . I too, thank God, am well, though, as I tell every one now, an old gentleman between sixty and seventy! I think now that if my Synods were over and our posts filled, I should have comparatively easy work; but so one goes on looking for rest here, but it flies before you like the rainbow which you can never reach. I have to preach unceasingly, and very very little time for sermons, or even for reading my Bible. I am always wishing to write to Emily, but my table is always covered, as at this moment, with a pile of unanswered letters, and it is not because I am idle, for I work as hard as most men."

Rest indeed was not to come, or freedom from sorrow. The December mail brought tidings, sudden and unexpected to her parents, who had not realised danger, of their eldest daughter having died on November 4th, 1869.

To the BISHOP of BOMBAY.

. . . "I reserve my great sorrow for the last—my dearest child Louisa is taken from us. She was, you know, an invalid. On the voyage she was remarkably well. Worsley gave up his living to Glover, S. Oxon readily appointing him. She was in London bright and lively, making all her arrangements. Glover had gone out to see Bullock. She went out shopping, but soon came back on foot, apparently feeling ill. She reached my brother's door, knocked, and sank down. With the aid of the servants she walked upstairs, tried to undress, and fell. On Glover's return he found her in this state. She had not spoken, and she died after sixteen hours, without exchanging word or look with him. 'The Lord hath given, and the Lord hath taken away.' You know how precious she was to us."

"Our darling child's departure is the first break in our happy family where all have loved each other," the Bishop wrote to Mr. Edward Gray, December 16th. "The call has been sudden, but it comes from her Father and our Father, and we bow to it. His blessed Will be done, whatever it be. She cannot come back to us; but we shall, I trust, one day join her before the Throne. She was very precious to me. I love my girls all dearly, but, perhaps, she was the nearest to my heart. She used as a child and as a girl, till she married, to tell all her faults to me."

And to his son he wrote, "You will be glad to hear that we are all well, and resigned to God's Will in calling away our sweet child. Our previous accounts of her led us to hope that she would recover health and strength in a colder climate. It was sad for Edward that he could not exchange one parting word or look with her to whom he had been so tender and

devoted; the unconsciousness must have been the greatest trial. How would one word, one look, have been prized! God's will be done. She is, I trust, happier than with us, who loved her very dearly. Agnes and Blanche were, I think, more deferentially attached to her than I remember to have seen in sisters before. Dear children, they are very nice. Your mother just like herself—as you may suppose, tranquil and collected, going about her work as usual. I have offered Edward the Archdeaconry again, or to live with us as Chaplain till something turns up. The news reached me just as I was to have a party of thirty here—Clergy and families—to discuss matters to be brought before the Synod. Only few came, but we went through the work to be done. That day's post brought me forty letters—many of them very anxious:—Merriman declining, after all, to go as Bishop to the State;—Bishop Welby doubting whether he can come to our Synod. . . . I fear now for the Free State. It will fall to me to take care of it, and as I cannot effectually do this, it will grow weaker and weaker. I have full forty folio sheets of Canons prepared for the Provincial Synod, and written out by your mother. We have still several services to prepare. Take care of yourself, my dearest boy. I try not to love one child more than another, but you, perhaps because you are absent, seem nearest to my heart."

The shadow of a greater sorrow still was hanging over the Bishop when he wrote the following touching letter to his brother:—

"Bishop's Court, January 13th, 1870.

. . . "Sophy is no better as to her complaint, but a little stronger. When I can, I now put her on her horse for an hour and a half, and walk by her side. But we have seldom more than one day in the week that we can do this. She is now doing too much in the way of preparing accounts and statistics for the Synod. . . . You talk about my going to England. My dear Edward, I would not move a little finger for anything this world has to give. I have far more of God's good gifts

than I deserve. All that I do feel is that from circumstances I have been so overworked that I have never had time to write sermons as I ought, or to read theology, and first of all in this line, my Bible. My work is all badly done, because of necessity hurriedly. All that I wish for, is full forgiveness, and the cleansing from all sin. I want nothing this world can give. Never trouble your head therefore about me. I would go anywhere where God called me: I would go nowhere unless He called me."

The Synod took place as appointed. "We had just enough difference of opinion to prevent dulness," the Bishop wrote (January 30th, 1870). "—— and —— were talkative about the Church of England in South Africa, but they did not carry even the laity with them, and gave in with a good grace. We had a discussion too on the hymn in the Appendix to Hymns Ancient and Modern on the Annunciation.[1] I am not very accurately reported, but all acquiesced after I had spoken, with the exception of three. I said what I did about the Eucharist with reference to a controversy here, and endeavoured to show disputants that they were nearer to each other than they imagined, and to give the subject a general lift. You will be glad to hear that the dearest mother does not seem worse for her great exertions during the last fortnight. She and the girls went in every day to the Synod, and we had seventy-eight each day to luncheon in the Grammar School, and twenty-two to dinner here, and she had with Bessie to arrange everything. The Free State finances are likely to give me much trouble,—I do not, however, think that I shall go there after the Synod, but to Namaqua Land; and to the State, God willing, in September. Then the opening of the Provincial Synod, with my address. The Diocesan Synod did not pass a single bad resolution. I have prepared a large body of Canons for discussion."

"*February* 16*th*, We are getting towards the close of our

[1] No. 376. "Shall we not love thee, mother dear,
Whom Jesus loves so well?"

fifth week's session in Synods, and are very tired. We are at it all day and every day. The first fortnight was Diocesan, the last three weeks Provincial. I fear we shall complete the month. We have all the work of organising the Province, securing our property, discipline as regards Bishops and Clergy, and much more. We have still fifty mouths daily to feed. Generally at 7.30 I sit with the Bishops till 8.30. Sometimes from 9.30 to 10. Then ride into town, sending the Synod in a van to the station. At 11.30 we begin—stop for luncheon for half-an-hour at 2—break up at 6. I reach home just in time to wash for 7.30 dinner. Then chapel, and bed. This is our daily course. We are going on very well."

To Mrs. Williamson.

"February 17th, 1870.

"I snatch a moment while waiting for the dinner-bell, after a long and tiring day, to write you a line. (Bell rung.) Since I wrote the above we have had another hard day ending in a most successful Mission meeting at night, at which the distant Bishops and Clergy spoke very well. To-day ends the fifth week. We get very slowly on, because every clause of every Canon is debated. . . . The work done is, I hope, well done. We have fairly worn out our laity, and not a few take occasional naps. I tell them they are eating up the fat of the land. I keep myself in exercise by riding in and out."

To Edward Gray, Esq.

"Bishop's Court, February 28th, 1870.

"We have just concluded our Provincial Synod. . . It leaves me somewhat poorly. This week will be taken up with finishing the business it has left to be done. . . The Synod has done a considerable work, and it has done it well. The Bishop of Graham's Town has been of very great service. The toil and labour have been very great. The Bishops will, I believe, return home by the end of this week. We have entertained two Synods for an eighth part of a year! Sophy is a little the worse for her fatigue, but not much. Her complaint is no

better. I am now constrained to think about and prepare for my two long and wearing journeys of this year to Namaqua Land and the Free State. I have no vigour just now left to me."

The Synod certainly did do some very important work. After certain preliminary resolutions had been carried, a "Declaration of Fundamental Principles" was drawn up in the following words:—

"We, being by representation the Church of the Province of South Africa, do declare that we receive and maintain the Faith of our Lord Jesus Christ as taught in the Holy Scriptures, held by the Primitive Church, summed up in the Creeds, and affirmed by the undisputed General Councils. And we do further declare that we receive and maintain the Doctrine, Sacraments, and Discipline of Christ, according as the Church of England has received and set forth the same in its standards of Faith and Doctrine; and we receive the Book of Common Prayer, and of ordering of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, to be used according to the form therein prescribed, in Public Prayer and administration of the Sacraments and other Holy Offices; and we accept the English version of the Holy Scriptures as appointed to be read in Churches. And further we disclaim for this Church the right of altering any of the Standards of Faith and Doctrine now in use in the Church of England.

"Provided that nothing herein contained shall prevent this Church from accepting, if it shall so determine, any alterations in the Formularies of the Church (other than the Creeds) which may be adopted by the Church of England, or allowed by any General Synod, Council, Congress, or other Assembly of the Churches of the Anglican Communion; or from making at any time such adaptations and abridgments of, and additions to, the services of the Church as may be required by the circumstances of this Province, and shall be consistent with the spirit and teaching of the Book of Common Prayer. Provided that all changes in, or additions to the Services of the Church made by the Church of this Province shall be liable to revision by any Synod

of the Anglican Communion to which the Province shall be invited to send representatives."

A Constitution was next drawn up in twenty-four articles, and twenty-seven Canons were set forth ruling a wide series of subjects,—the Provincial Synod, Functions of the Metropolitan, the Election and Confirmation of Bishops, and other matters relating to them; the Spiritualities and Temporalities of vacant Bishoprics; the formation of Dioceses; the Presentation and Institution to Benefices; the Services of the Church; Judicial Proceedings and Sentences, Appeals, Vestries, Churchwardens and Sidesmen, Trusts, etc. etc.

The Metropolitan wrote concerning these documents to the Bishop of Oxford: "I sent you the Canons passed in our Provincial Synod. You will see that they are very much the same as those adopted in Canada, New Zealand, etc. The Constitution Deed, which contains all the important points, was forwarded to R. Palmer for his revision. He highly approved of it, and made several important alterations. Judge Connor and the Solicitor-General here both helped to perfect it. I hope that the Secretary of State for the Colonies is not likely to give any trouble. The best thing for him to do is to order that the Duke of Newcastle's Instructions (Despatches, June 5, 1862; February 4, 1864) shall be carried out. He said that ecclesiastical grants as they fall in should be placed at the disposal of the Synod of the Anglican Communion. The absurd thing is that ecclesiastical grants are not likely to last above a year or two. . . . I am thankful to say that not a voice has been raised in this land against any part of my proceedings. Men have come to understand the need there is for making laws where no laws exist, and the Church is as united as any Church on earth. . . . We are anxiously looking out for a Bishop for the State, and for the Bishop of Madagascar. All going on well in the Church here. Were it not for the bankrupt condition of the Colony, we should be quite at ease. . . . The worry of all these questions takes more out of me than any amount of hard work."

So much was this the case that when the immediate pres-

sure of the Synod, and necessity for keeping up to its work was over, the Bishop broke down. When recovering (though indeed his constitution never rallied from the effects of over-strain now developed) he wrote in some detail to his son:

"Bishop's Court, April 1st, 1870.

. . . "This letter will be largely about myself. I have been seriously ill, but am, thank God, now daily recovering strength. I was very weary, and somewhat knocked up, before the Synods began. You know ever since I returned from England I have had a very trying time. . . . All these things took a good deal out of me; and when at home I have been a mere hack, not able to say where I would go on a Sunday, but 'tied to be a supply,' as the Dissenters say. Then the preparation of Canons for the Synod kept me very hard at work, and all this was crowned with six continuous weeks' riding into town, most days during the heat of summer (though this, I think, kept me up, as it gave me quiet and exercise), and a house full, and a good deal of mental work and anxiety. Though very weary, I stood out till the day when the last guests were leaving. Then I could not get off the sofa from violent headache and fever. As soon as they were gone I went to bed. Next day I was so much better that the doctor left me. The following day I was obliged to send for him again. He said that it was low fever, the consequence of overwork of the brain; and that nothing but entire rest would restore me. I went next day with your mother to Kalk Bay; got worse there, and weaker every day. Came back here; told the doctor that I had other symptoms. . . . I grew weaker, and had a good deal of fever. We came back finally last Tuesday, and since then I have been growing wonderfully stronger each day. Have had most quiet refreshing nights; have recovered my appetite, and lost my fever. . . . I can now walk an hour, and perspire freely to the doctor's delight; and I ride nearly two hours at a foot's pace with your mother,—she, poor soul, not being able to canter. When the doctors had a consultation about me on Tuesday, I made them also sit upon her. They examined her thoroughly, and decided

that there was no mischief; they think that returning strength will remove her ailments. I am much more comfortable about her. As to myself, I *feel* better than I have done for a very long time. What the medical men say is that my mind must have rest; that anxiety and overwork have brought on my complaint. One cannot wonder. The last six years have been one unceasing struggle. Few know what anxiety that Colenso matter caused me. The doctors a little time ago said that I must give up Namaqua Land and the Free State. We have a 'Spider' building, however, and my recovery has been so rapid during this week as to show, I think, that I shall be fit ere long for a journey, and that it will probably do us both good, but of course we shall be guided by the counsel of the medical men.

"I am still in great trouble about men. The Dean has resigned; the congregation ask for Merriman. I have heard of no one for the State. We are in great anxiety about poor Glover. This is the fifty-second day since the 'Briton' left England, and we have heard nothing of her. Anyhow he must have suffered a good deal. The succeeding mail is already two days after her time. Every one seems to be pleased, or at least satisfied, with the work of our Synods. I trust that this Church is upon a safe foundation. The extreme poverty, and the mixed and scattered populations, seem to be the chief difficulties to contend with. I shall be glad to hear about your new work."

"*April 5th,* Getting stronger every day; nearly all threatening symptoms gone. Dr. Ebden consents to my going into town this week for light work."

That winter the Bishop's son had accepted the Vicarage of Helmsley, Yorkshire. It is touching to see the toil-worn, well-nigh spent African Bishop looking back half-longingly to the lowlier sphere which he had all through consistently said he would have preferred for himself, had *preference* ever been admitted as an influence with him where God's call was concerned.

"Curious it is," he says, writing to the new Vicar, "that there are perhaps few spiritual posts that I should like better than that particular one. Rievaulx and the country would both have charms for me, and the management of a country parish of that size is just what I have thought myself best fitted for. I have always said that, so far as I could see, my happiness and usefulness would be greatest in such a post. . . . Your decision must have been given before this reaches you. . . . You know that I have all through life attached great weight to a call. . . . This wears in my eyes something of the appearance of a call, and the point ought to be carefully weighed."

Some of the Bishop's advice to his son on going to his new work was too essentially practical not to be valued by many. "The parish is quite a little Diocese; the difficulty in providing for its spiritual wants arises from the number of small hamlets so near to the parish church. I think that you must weigh carefully all sides of the question before providing all these hamlets with buildings and services. You may in your strength and zeal be able to have for some years a network of services all around you, and shut up meetings; but fifty years hence will the living be able to support a staff of Curates for these? And if not, what then? Our cathedral towns seem to me to teach us a lesson. From the centre there went forth Clergy to serve small churches—*e.g.* York—and these were multiplied. The stipend being small, feeble men fill these unimportant cures, and then one great Methodist Chapel capable of holding 2,000 or 3,000 springs up, and they get their best men for an important post, and the small churches are dull and empty. The same sort of process of carrying religion to the doors of people is going on in Cape Town. It seems necessary or desirable, but what the upshot may be I know not. Anyhow you will endeavour to make all look to the parish church as their mother, and communicate there on the great festivals. Remember that you are now going to pour new wine into old bottles. However cautious and guarded you may be, you will be a great trial to your people. They, I doubt not, are purely

ignorant of much that is as A B C to you. There is a great deal to be learnt from 'ye were not able to bear it, neither yet are ye able.' . . . Do not give your people a *cheap* religion. Let the very poorest give their penny a week, and shilling or half-crown a quarter for the funds of the Church, and have weekly offertory besides, but do not be in a hurry to establish these. Make yourself felt before you move."

The Bishop's recovery continued. "I am getting stronger daily," he wrote, April 29th, 1870, "though I have not returned altogether to my ordinary diet. I feel worries more I think, and I do not sleep as well as I did, but I feel *quite* well."

He wrote, April 26th, 1870, to Mrs. Mowbray: "Do you take any interest in the Roman Council? I do. I think it must weaken the hold of Rome on the English mind. Decide as they will about the infallibility, they must, I think, suffer loss. I have been reading Pusey, and Döllinger, and the Abbé Gratry, and the Bishop of Orleans, and Manning, with much interest. The Infallibilists are, I think, in argument entirely beaten out of the field, but for all this we may have a new dogma. But what then? Who shall say? The next move ought to be a visit from the Patriarch of Constantinople. All this is coming on, and so is disestablishment in England. The Irish Bishops do not appear to me to have been firm enough. I would have had them say, We can do without you, but you cannot do without us. If you drive us to it, we will have nothing to do with you, but begin our Church, if need be, with a dozen faithful members."

To this period we must refer an undated letter to the Bishop's brother, who had apparently expressed a wish that his work were transferred to England.

"Your love leads you to wish me on a throne of thorns in England. I have had, and still have, deep anxieties here, but I believe that there are few posts in the world at this time more surrounded with crosses than an English Bishop's.

The mere work of an active earnest man is killing, and would soon slay me. Look at Selwyn,—it is purely overwork and anxiety which has knocked him up. . . . No, my dear brother; all matters of this kind had better be dismissed from your mind. No one will ask a man who has made many enemies, and been in the thick of a great fight, to take a high post in England; and I should not be equal to it mentally, physically, or spiritually, and should most unfeignedly shrink from it. It is rest of mind that I yearn for, but that is not to be had here. My office of Metropolitan gives me more work to do, and more anxiety than my Diocese, and this is more than I can properly manage."

And again, May 29th, 1870:

"I am, I think, quite well again, though worries tell more upon me. We still adhere to the plan of going to the State about the end of August: your mother is not fit, but she will go. She spends most of her time lying on a sofa, with a hot bottle to her feet. The medical men still say there is nothing serious. You ask if I ever contemplate resignation? Certainly not while I am fit for work. I did not come out here to please myself. If I were to be unfit for work, it might be different. I believe that Bishop Wilkinson is at sea, having taken the oath to Canterbury!!!"

The latter allusion has reference to a difficulty which had been some months in existence. It will be remembered that when in England last the Metropolitan was in communication with Mr. Wilkinson as a future Bishop of Zululand—Miss Mackenzie having undertaken to raise an endowment in memory of her brother, the first Missionary Bishop in Africa.

The Bishop wrote to Miss Mackenzie, August 17th, 1869:

"As to the appointment, we (*i.e.* the Bishops of the Province) should be quite prepared to consent to its being made by the Colonial Bishoprics Council. Every step, however, connected with the appointment will require the most careful attention, if mischief and schism are not to arise. You undertook the raising an endowment in connection with myself as Metro-

politan of South Africa, and your efforts were commended to the Church formally by the Bishops of this Province. The basis upon which the plan was undertaken was that the future Bishop should be a Bishop of this Province. He must, therefore, take the oath of canonical obedience to the Metropolitan of the Province, and pledge himself to submit to the Provincial Synod. If this be not required of him previous to consecration, this Church will not recognise him as a Bishop of the Province, nor will the Clergy in Zululand receive him as their Bishop.

"The Bishops of this Province must, in order to a canonical appointment, confirm the election of any one chosen to the office of Bishop within the Province. I have no doubt that they would authorise a Bishop or Bishops, say the Bishop of Oxford, to do this in their name. There would be the greatest unwillingness on the part of, I believe, every Bishop of the Province to allow the appointment of a Bishop of this Province to be made by the two Archbishops and the Bishop of London. Though opposing all our late proceedings, the Bishop of London (Jackson) was in heart with us, and we respect his single-minded and devoted character. The two Archbishops opposed all we did with bitterness and vehement hostility—the Archbishop of Canterbury (Tait) from the day when I submitted to Archbishop Sumner Colenso's work on the Romans to this hour; the Archbishop of York from the time of his appointment. We cannot and dare not trust these to select a Bishop for this land. The Archbishop of Canterbury has never acknowledged my communication as to the consecration of Bishop Macrorie, ordered to be made by our Provincial Synod in accordance with the Lambeth reports; the Archbishop of York declined to receive my communication, and it was returned to me with 'Refused' written on it.

"We have placed the Clergy in Zululand within the Diocese of Maritzburg. We shall decline to take it out of that Diocese, unless we are satisfied as to the future Bishop. I may add that we should not be inclined to receive any one of whom you, as the foundress of the See, and the sister of him in whose memory it was founded, did not approve.

"Practically the best course would be for you, in communication with Bullock, to agree upon a man, and get Bullock to submit his name to the Colonial Bishoprics Council. Then for the Bishop of Oxford to consent to the appointment on our behalf. He might then either be consecrated in England, making the declaration or oaths as to the Metropolitan and Provincial Synod, or be sent out for consecration at our Provincial Synod in January next. . . . We want three more Bishoprics here;—without counting Madagascar;—George, Transvaal, and Independent Kaffraria. What a marvel it is that Christian men, abounding in wealth, do not leap forward to found centres of life and truth, and establish at the small cost of £5,000 permanent works for God, not here only, but in Japan, China, India, etc.—Ever affectionately yours, R. CAPETOWN."

To the Same.

"Bishop's Court, April 13th, 1870.

"My dear Miss Mackenzie—I am very sorry that, now you have succeeded through your unceasing efforts in raising the endowment of £5,000, there should be difficulties as regards the consecration of Mr. Wilkinson. The question which is now raised is one of principle. As I understand you it is this: Can the Bishops of this Province consent to a future Bishop of the Province taking, at his consecration, an oath of canonical obedience to the Archbishop of Canterbury alone, or to the Archbishop and the Metropolitan of South Africa? I answer, without a moment's hesitation, the thing is impossible. We claim to be a branch (I speak of the Church of England) of the Catholic Church. The Canons of the Church are accepted by us. It would be in utter violation of those Canons for a Bishop of one Province to take the oath of obedience to the Metropolitan of another. It would be equally uncanonical for him to own obedience to *two* Metropolitans.

"The Church of England can of course, if it pleases, consecrate a Bishop and send him out to Africa, without his being in any way connected with this Province. In such case he might reasonably promise obedience to the See of Canterbury, but

this is not the case under discussion. There is a duly constituted Province here with a Metropolitan. The new Diocese forms part of the Province. It is at this moment included in the Diocese of Maritzburg. You have raised an endowment for the new See on the distinct understanding that it should still form part of the Province. The right of Ordination belongs, by the Canons, to the Metropolitan and Bishops of the Province. They have difficulties in consequence of their great distances from each other in performing this act, and they ask, as an act of charity, the Bishops of the Church of England to do it for them. It is monstrous for the Archbishop to reply, 'We will not unless the Bishop takes an oath of canonical obedience to me!!' It really is a very long stride towards the '*alterius orbis Papa!*' Neither of his predecessors thought of claiming in this way Patriarchal Jurisdiction. There have been eight Bishops consecrated for this Province since I have been Metropolitan. Not one of them has ever taken an oath of obedience to Canterbury. I quite agree that it is a fair question whether the Archbishop should be Patriarch of all Churches of our Communion. I have not the strong feeling against this which some have, and I got inserted in our Provincial Canons a clause giving the Metropolitan of this Province a right of appeal to Canterbury under certain circumstances. But if he were Patriarch he could not canonically receive the oaths of obedience from the Suffragans of this Province. His only jurisdiction would be over and through the Metropolitan. I confess that I am astonished that any in these days, when something ought to be known of the first principles of Canon law, should put forward such a claim.

"I have further to observe that if the oath were to be taken to the Archbishop, the Bishop could not by the rules of our Provincial Synod be a Bishop of this Province, nor could we assign him for his Diocese a portion of one of our existing Dioceses. We should be precluded from this by the Canons of our Synod, which are already in your hands.

"I am very sorry for this unexpected difficulty, but I am bound to set facts before you. I am sure that you will set

them before Mr. Wilkinson. Will you tell him that I am sorry I cannot write? I am only just recovering from a very serious illness, brought on, the medical men say, entirely by over-exertion and over-anxiety; and letters like this tax me and do me no good. If the English Bishops cannot or will not help us, you have my full authority to ask the dear good Primus of Scotland to do what he can. If he fails, we must wait till three of us can meet, perhaps in Natal. If you will keep me informed I will do what I can, but it is very wrong to drive us to such straits. . . . We are still longing for a Bishop for the Free State. If he does not come soon, I must go there in spite of the doctors. You know what a journey it is!"

Meanwhile, the Rev. T. G. Wilkinson was consecrated in Westminster Abbey, May 8th, 1870, at the same time with Dr. Durnford, Bishop of Chichester, and the Rev. J. Hughes, Bishop of S. Asaph;—the Bishop of London acting under Commission for the Archbishop of Canterbury,—the Archbishop of York, and the Bishops of Winchester, Lichfield, Llandaff, and S. David's taking part. The Bishop of Winchester wrote on the very day of the consecration to Bishop Gray:

"Beddington House, Croydon, May 8th, 1870.

"My dear Brother—This morning I have laid my hand on the head of Wilkinson to send him out to the Mission. It has been an anxious time and matter many ways. I hope I have acted as you approve. I consulted with Lichfield, as I found him joined with me in the confirming. What, after correspondence and intercourse with the Archbishop was settled, was, that he should in the service take the oath of canonical obedience to him in token of general fealty to the English Church; but that it was to be repeated to you before he did any Episcopal act, and that his mission was to be from you, and his responsibility to you, there being no appeal from you. I had many doubts, arising however, only from your words, for to *me* the case seemed clear. The oath to the Archbishop was the formal acknowledgment of the dormant

Patriarchate,—dormant because there is no mode whatever of promoting appeal to him. This was settled, the day fixed, the passage secured, when the Archbishop of York raised a difficulty from the terms of the Act of Parliament—viz., that the consecration under the wording of the act be by one of the Archbishops *in person*. The law officers thought that there was something in it. But, through Gladstone's kindness, we got a new license out for the Archbishop of York, and he and I and Lichfield consecrated Wilkinson. He took the oath to York, York explaining that it was to be transferred to you by a new oath, like an oath of canonical obedience taken to a new Bishop, before he officiated in your Province. I trust you will approve. . . . Your letter cheered me much in showing how your firm principle is beginning at last thoroughly to reward you in the stedfastness of the Diocese and Province. May our God guide you to the end, beloved Brother. Indeed He has made you a pattern to us all."

BISHOP GRAY to Miss MACKENZIE.

"June 28th, 1870.

"I confess I scarcely see how Bishop Wilkinson can take another oath to me. He has already accepted another Metropolitan, and the Church of England has given him Mission on those terms. I may yet be at home when he arrives, but I ought to start before the middle of August. The wife is no better. If I were not compelled to make this journey, I should take her home for advice."

Though in a measure repeating much of the letter to Miss Mackenzie, the Metropolitan's reply to Bishop Wilberforce on this important subject is too weighty to be omitted.

"Bishop's Court, July 4th, 1870.

"My dear Bishop—Very many thanks for your long and kind letter of May 8th. I am sure that you did all that could be done, considering the Archbishop's views, in the matter of the consecration of the Bishop of Zululand. Nevertheless the question which has now been raised is of such public import-

ance to the whole Church, and of such vital moment to Colonial Churches, that you would wish, I feel assured, that I should discuss the points at once, and say what we all feel here concerning them.

We are agreed that the system of Metropolitans and Provinces determined upon by the Bishops of the Church in 1853 under Archbishop Sumner should continue in the Colonies. The Archbishop, however, contends for some provision whereby fealty to the Church of England may be secured and the Patriarchate acknowledged; and has therefore insisted that the oath taken by Suffragan Bishops at their consecration shall be not to their own Metropolitan but to him. He is willing, as I understand, that on arriving in the Province in which they are to labour, they should take a second oath of canonical obedience to the Metropolitan and receive mission from him. Now upon these points I would make the following observations:—I. I have never been unwilling, nor have, I think, any Colonial Churches, that in some way the Colonial Churches should bind themselves to the Mother Church (as distinct from the Establishment). I heartily concurred in what was done at the Lambeth Conference in this matter. For years I have seen and urged here and in England, publicly and privately, that this could only be done by restoring the system of graduated Synods. We have in our Provincial Synod done what we could in this matter, by subordinating our proceedings to those of an Imperial Synod. *Next,* I have, personally, not the same objection which some have to the giving of Patriarchal powers to Canterbury; but if these are given, they should be granted by some public act of recognition by the Church. As a matter of fact, Canterbury is not one of the Patriarchates recognised by the Church, nor has the Archbishop, in law, jurisdiction beyond his own Province. But if he were a Patriarch, he would not be entitled to take, at consecration, an oath of obedience from the Suffragan of another Province. The point would be met by the Metropolitan taking the oath: the Suffragan's subordination is mediate, not immediate.

"The question is really not one merely of order or propriety.

It is one of very great importance to Colonial Churches. Suppose a case of discipline to arise here, such as we have had, and the Bishop were to reject our authority. A court of law would rule, and rule rightly, that the oath taken at consecration governed the case; that by that oath he had voluntarily submitted himself to the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan to whom he had bound himself (in this case, apparently York). It seems to me that the oath he has taken places him out of this Province.

"You say that that was not the intention, but it does not appear that anything, either before the consecration or at it, was said or done to show this, but that his oath was taken exactly as it was taken by the two other Bishops, and must have as much binding force on him as theirs on them. I am, I confess, in a great state of perplexity as to what I ought to do. I doubt whether, with my view as to what the consecration oath implies, I ought to put to the Bishop another oath which might seem to be at variance with that already taken. I doubt whether he ought to consent to take it. I seem to have no excuse for calling upon him. I do not give him mission. As I understand it, the English Bishops have already done this at our request. If consecrated as Twells was under the Jerusalem Act, the very limits of his Diocese are assigned him. I may be wrong as to facts, and it is possible that the other Bishops may not feel the difficulty so strongly as myself, but it is not unlikely that they may feel it more strongly; and then I do not see what course is open to us but to let Bishop Wilkinson go to his Diocese without taking any oath, and write to the Archbishop to state officially what our view of the Bishop's position is. On the other hand, if this course be adopted, a Bishop in a country already part of this Province is not a Bishop of the Province. We cannot call upon him to subscribe to our Provincial Synod, which makes him take an oath to me. We have no means whatever of enforcing discipline as regards him or his Clergy.

"If all this has force in it, you will see that the system laid down by the Archbishop would simply break up the Provinces

which have been founded. Every Bishop who has been consecrated for South Africa since I have been Metropolitan—Armstrong, Colenso, and Cotterill, under Archbishop Sumner; Welby, Twells, under Archbishop Longley—has taken the oath to me. The introducing another system, which I hold to be entirely uncanonical, is, in my belief, simply destructive of the unity and discipline of Colonial Churches, for with us everything hinges upon the oath. . . . I am, I trust, pretty well again. My poor wife is far from well. Were it not for the necessity of going to the Free State, I should probably have taken her to England for advice and an operation. The Church in the Free State, however, will collapse if not cared for, and we hear of no Bishop. I am urged even to go to the Transvaal, where two Deacons, with their congregations, plead that they have had no communion for two years."

Misgivings as to his wife's condition were creeping in daily increasing force upon the Bishop's mind. On June 25th, after sending precautionary advice to his son, who had been ill, he goes on to say:

"I am doing this myself. It is sorely against the grain, and with feelings that I am shirking work, and a knowledge that I have not very long to work, that I preach only once on a Sunday, having my second service in the chapel here. You ask for honest accounts of us both—I am nearly if not quite well. . . . If I had no worries, I think that I should be quite right. . . . I wish I could report equally well of the dearest mother. She, however, causes me uneasiness. Her complaint is the more distressing in that she has a great deal of pain, especially when she is cold. But at times she is without pain, and she sleeps well. I drive her out whenever it is fine, or, as yesterday, put her upon her horse Bokkie, and walk by her side. . . The medical men say there is no danger. . . I confess, however, that if I were not constrained to go to the State, I should feel inclined to take her home for advice, and even yet I may do so. In her present state I could not allow her to go with me on Visitation."

In July the symptoms became so serious that, although it was very inconvenient to alter arrangements long made, the Bishop felt he had no choice but to follow Dr. Ebden's advice, and take his wife to England for treatment. The decision was so suddenly made that there was no time to announce it to those at home; and by the first mail which could have carried tidings of their intentions the Bishop and Mrs. Gray arrived in England.

During the passage, the Bishop wrote to Miss Fair, Superior of S. George's Home:

"At Sea, July 27th, 1870.

"You will be glad to hear that we are getting on well. My wife has, I think, decidedly improved at sea. She looks better, and is able to sit on deck in her chair about six hours a day. G. is much the same. . . None of us are, I suppose, peculiarly happy at sea, but we are a very harmonious party, and I think that the daily prayers are attended better than when we came out. Nearly every one attends, I think, which adds much to my comfort. We hope to be at S. Helena early to-morrow morning. I shall desert my ladies for the day, and this time probably get my ride up to the Bishop's. I am very weary already of the sea, but we could not have had anything more favourable. In spite of all, however, I pine for the land, and heartily wish that I were on my way up to the State, to encourage the poor Clergy there. It seems so strange to be packed off suddenly to England when one has no wish to be there! But I doubt not God orders all things well, and that good will come of this forced absence. . . My love and blessing rest upon you all.—Ever your affectionate father in Christ, R. CAPETOWN."

The Bishop wrote from Plymouth, August 17th, to announce their landing, saying that his wife was none the worse for the voyage, which had been very favourable. A consultation of physicians took place, and the result was that little more than giving temporary relief could be hoped for.

"They wish her to remain for some time under their care, that they may watch her," he wrote to his son (August 30th).

"I told them that if they thought she would not live long, I believed she would rather go home and see her children, but that if they thought that they could even partially restore her, I should feel it my duty to keep her here at all cost; they urged her to remain. . . . I thought it best to tell you all this before you came. I need not say that she is full of patience and gentleness. She says that she has had a very happy life; that we have long had good health, and must take cheerfully the loss of it."

In reply to a similar note to the Bishop of Winchester (Wilberforce) that loving friend wrote in a more unmeasured tone of distress than Bishop Gray himself:

"Testwood, September 1st, 1870.

"My dearest Brother—Your letter quite overwhelmed me. It is well for her. It must be well for you, for God cannot forget those who have served Him as you have served Him. But it is a dark and trying dispensation. May He guide you aright. . . . I fear myself that it is not to be hoped that there will be a restoration, but for those I love dearly my heart early desponds. It was broken so early in my own life that new sorrows seem always to make it jar with notes of hopelessness. But the end may be long delayed. . . . Pray let me hear soon again, for my heart is very greatly with you. . . . Will you give her my most affectionate remembrances? May God support and bless you and her.—Ever your most affectionate

"S. WINTON."

To Miss Fair Bishop Gray wrote:

"53 Cambridge Square, September 7, 1870.

"My anxiety about my dear wife has been greatly increased. The doctors give me little hope; there is very great pain and increasing weakness. She is as calm and patient as possible. Few know how much she has suffered for a year past. The doctors urge me to wait and see what their skill can do; of course I shall be guided by them. She only moves now from her bed to the sofa. I have many invitations, but I do

not mean, except on great occasions, to leave my wife for a night, and therefore I can only work about London, which is more desolate than I could have imagined. Literally every one seems to be away, consequently there is not much to be got.

"Yesterday I went to see the Mother (of Clewer) who has just returned from abroad. She was very kind, and went over all the buildings with me. But she has neither a Sister nor an Associate for us at present. . . . Mrs. Monsell said she thought that she could not send Sisters for education under three years, and from all she said I believe it is not now in her power. I have heard from Upton Richards, saying that the All Saints Sisters do not take up educational work. I have written to Butler, but he is away. . . . All my dear daughters will, I am sure, pray for me, and ask that my dear wife may be spared. And all will strive more and more to love one another. I pray for you all. The Peace of God be with you. My best love to each."

To his son the Bishop wrote again, September 15th: "I write a line to say the doctors have just been here. Your mother has been easier, and I think a little stronger. Dr. —— is satisfied with a certain improvement. He will not, however, fully discuss her prospects with me till the day after I get home, Friday in next week. The best he allows me to hope is a possible thrusting back of the disorder for a time."

To the Bishop of Winchester.

"53 Cambridge Terrace, September 16th, 1870.

. . . "I am to know next Friday whether I am to return immediately to the Cape that she may see her children before she dies, or whether she will derive benefit from a longer residence in England under the best advice. She is perfectly calm, contented, happy. I must try to see you before I go, if I have to leave suddenly. I wish to see what can be done to make consecrations in England canonical, and not subversive of Colonial Provinces. I wish also to express my great hope that

the Church of England will at this time renew her appeal to a Free Œcumenical Council, for the sake of Christendom—for her own sake. Nothing, as it seems to me, would at this moment more commend her to Christendom than such an appeal. There are many other points I should like to have discussed, but God only knows whether there will be a time. I will write to you after Friday, which is the day for me in this life. I am going meantime for a night to Charlie. I should not like to leave England without seeing him in his parish.—Ever very affectionately yours, R. CAPETOWN."

"I have offered the Free State to Jones,[1] and told him that I had consulted you. I like what I have seen of him very much. He is young, but he seems very sober, and likely, I think, to evangelise, if spared, that large region."

That waiting for "the day for me in this life," was a heavy time. Mrs. Gray was as cheerful and contented as ever, saying continually that "it is all as it should be, I can wish for nothing better," and her husband said, "She has never been overcome except when speaking of the suddenness of sweet little Loui's death—she prayed against that;" but she could not bear much talking, or seeing any one for long, and at times fits of pain so severe came on that, in spite of all her tender longing to save her husband distress, the poor sufferer was forced to go and lie on her bed moaning until she fell asleep. The patient endurance of both is very touching. "If the doctors do not say that her life will soon be cut short, there are many reasons in the way of work for my remaining at least two months longer in England," the Bishop wrote.

It was on October 6th that the consultation, to which the Bishop still clung with some hope, took place, and as soon as it was over he wrote a few sad lines to his son to say that the medical men all agreed that the patient was much worse, the disease making progress, and that it was useless to try her with painful remedies which could not cure. "The disease is malignant, not benignant. She may perhaps live a year.

[1] The Rev. William West Jones, now the Bishop's successor at Cape Town.

I have not talked to her since, as she is always upset by the doctor's visit, and prefers my waiting a day. My impression is that she will wish to go on the 11th or 25th November, but you shall hear at latest on Saturday. I have long been engaged to preach at S. Lawrence's on All Saints' Day."

October 8th the Bishop wrote the following touching note to his youngest daughter:

"My dearest Flossy—I must send you a line. Probably your dear mother has told you that the doctors have given up all hope of her recovery, and that in consequence we think of returning home very soon. We must not repine, but be thankful that God has spared her so long to us. I trust that you will yet see her, and receive her last counsels and treasure them up for life. I am quite well, though worn by anxiety and the constant pressure of callers and letters. . . . Your dear mother suffers a good deal of pain—she is now moaning on the sofa while I write. Her great wish is to see her children once more. I have written to Agnes and Blanche at George. . . . Look at the xvii. chap. book iii. of Thomas à Kempis. Your dear mother for twenty years has tried to bring herself into conformity with what it teaches. She has had those words by heart for many years. Do you, my child, dwell upon them, and learn to have no will but God's.—Ever, my dearest child, your affectionate father, R. CAPETOWN."

To the Sisters at Cape Town the Bishop wrote:

"Now, God's Will be done. The Lord gave, and the Lord taketh away. She knows, and wishes to know all. She says it is all as it should be. She ever hoped that her death might not be sudden. She is calm, patient, cheerful, looking on to the end. . . . Now, as to work. Butler cannot help us, nor East Grinstead, nor Clewer, nor All Saints. My letter in the Church papers about your work has as yet brought no offers, but I am inquiring everywhere, and hear of some. I tell them I shall not dare to face you all without recruits. I am doing what I can as to sermons, but London is still empty, and I cannot go into

the country. My first month has produced little more than £100, and I have had no special offerings. To-morrow I preach at Stoke Newington and Highgate (not Dalton's); I am going for an evening meeting to Dalton's, and on S. Cyprian's Day to S. Cyprian's. . . . I am in much trouble about men. I have not yet a precentor. I have offered the State to three men, and I am looking out for Madagascar. I hope to see these appointments filled before I leave, but it is anxious and laborious work, writing about and selecting men. The Bishop of London has been most tenderly kind, and the Archbishop writes himself, very kindly. I am quite well, and have not spoken to any doctor, though I may do so before I leave. You are all, I know, interceding for us. I pray for you, I need scarce say. May God bless you all, and make you of one heart and mind, and fill you with love to one another, and enable you to see all the good in each other, and all the evil in yourselves. You may depend upon my doing all that I can for the Home. It is very near my heart.—Believe me, ever, my dear daughters in Christ, your affectionate father, R. CAPETOWN."

Another letter a little later says:

"On Tuesday afternoon we had our last consultation. It took from me the last remains of hope to which I had been clinging. The disease has made rapid progress. The doctors will not commit themselves now to any opinion as to how long she may be spared. If she returns to the Cape, they advise her leaving in three or four weeks, but I think they would advise her to stay if it were not for the work. She wishes to die at the Cape, to give her last counsels to the dear children, and to hand over her work to any who may be appointed to carry it on. I am going to-day to the City, to see about ships. Her mind is all that I could wish. She read to me last night, most touchingly, the 17th chapter of the third Book of Thomas à Kempis,[1] as illustrating her feelings. She had known that

[1] "My son, suffer Me to do with thee what I please; I know what is expedient for thee. Thou thinkest as man, thou judgest in many things as human feelings persuade thee.

"O Lord, what Thou sayest is true. Thy anxiety for me is greater than all

chapter by heart for twenty years, and her aim had been to school herself into agreement with it."

A further consultation with Dr. Farre gave some little more temporary encouragement, and probably helped the Bishop through some work which he felt it right to undertake, though he shrank from leaving his suffering wife for a night.[1] He undertook to go to Wolverton, Buckingham, Cambridge, etc., to Hastings, Chatham; and on S. Andrew's Day (November 30) the Bishop was in Scotland, in order to consecrate the new Bishop of the Free State (now called Bloemfontein), the Rev. Allan Webb. Mr. Webb was to have been consecrated in S. Paul's, with Dr. Cheetham, Bishop of Sierra Leone; and Dr. Huxtable, Bishop of Mauritius; but the Archbishop of Canterbury insisted on the oath of obedience to himself, and a long correspondence between him and the Metropolitan of Africa on the subject having brought forward nothing to make such a course seem other than uncanonical and injurious to the Colonial Churches, the Metropolitan decided on accepting the cordial hospitality of the Primus of Scotland (a decision in which, be it said, the Archbishop

care that I can take for myself. For he standeth but very totteringly, who casteth not all his anxiety upon Thee. O Lord, if only my will may remain right and firm towards Thee, do with me whatsoever shall please Thee. For it cannot be anything but good, whatsoever Thou shalt do with me.

"If it be Thy Will I should be in darkness, be Thou blessed; and if it be Thy Will I should be in light, be Thou again blessed. If Thou vouchsafe to comfort me, be Thou blessed; and if Thou wilt have me afflicted, be Thou ever equally blessed.

"My son, such as this ought to be thy state, if Thou desire to walk with Me. Thou oughtest to be as ready to suffer as to rejoice. Thou oughtest as cheerfully to be destitute and poor as full and rich.

"O Lord, for Thy Sake I will cheerfully suffer whatever shall come on me with Thy permission. From Thy Hand I am willing to receive indifferently good and evil, sweet and bitter, joy and sorrow, and for all that befalleth me I will be thankful. Keep me safe from all sin, and I shall fear neither death nor hell. So as Thou dost not cast me from Thee for ever, nor blot me out of the book of Life, whatever tribulation may befall me shall not hurt me."

[1] "I have never had harder work than since I came to town," he wrote. "It is often anxious days and sleepless nights. The letters about men and women, too, have been innumerable. I have still three or four on my list to whom I could have offered the State . . . but the refusals have been very depressing."

entirely acquiesced), and Mr. Webb was consecrated in Inverness Cathedral on S. Andrew's Day, the Metropolitan of South Africa being assisted by the Primus (Bishop of Moray and Ross), the Bishop of Aberdeen, and Bishop Abraham, who was sent by the Bishop of Lichfield to represent himself. It was the last time that Bishop Gray was to take part in any Church ceremonies in this country, and those who were present look back upon that day with a mingled sense of thankfulness and sadness. Not all his personal cares could turn that champion of the Church's liberties from his duty to her; and on his return he wrote to the Bishop of Winchester:

"I have heard with some surprise, not unmingled with indignation, that, in reply to the Archbishop's request for a license for the consecration of the Bishop of Madagascar, Lord Granville has expressed a reluctance to issue it. He requires to know the number of the Clergy already in that Mission, and the number of converts; and he intimates that, in his judgment, the Bishop of Mauritius might exercise jurisdiction over the island. He assumes to himself the right to decide what shall be the constitution of the Church's Missions; whether they shall or shall not have a Bishop at their head. You are aware that there is no Mission which has been founded in our time that has so great a weight of authority of the Church for its going forth in the completeness of her constitution. Nineteen Bishops, with many eminent Clergymen and laity, decided that there should be a Bishop. I trust that you and the dear Bishops of London, Lichfield, and Rochester, with whom I deeply regret that I cannot be to-night, will remonstrate against this petty act of persecution before it is too late. If Lord Granville will not listen to reason, I hope that you will make your appeal to Mr. Gladstone. I believe that he still loves his Church and hates injustice. If he will not interfere to stop this contemplated wrong, he will lose the hold he has upon many very earnest men. The Romanists may have their Bishop; the Norwegians theirs; any and every other religious body in the land may found its mission in its own way; the

Church alone, which the State affects to cherish and support, shall be deprived of her liberties!

"Can we wonder that those who love their Church are day by day demanding in increased numbers that she shall be set free from this oppressive thraldom?—Ever, my dear Bishop, affectionately yours, R. CAPETOWN.

"Why did not Lord Granville raise his objections in the case of Zululand? There are but three Clergy at present in that Mission. I did not consecrate Madagascar in Scotland, because he will not be in my Province."

It was decided before now that the Bishop and Mrs. Gray should sail[1] for Africa, December 11th, by the ship "Northam," their son, the Vicar of Helmsley, who had been suffering from an attack on the chest, going with them. It was, of course, known to all their friends that this was a last parting from Mrs. Gray; but probably most may have hoped to see the dear Bishop again. He did not think so himself. He wrote to the best loved of all his friends, the Bishop of Winchester (Wilberforce):

"53 Cambridge Terrace, December 5th, 1870.

"My dear Brother—I had hoped to have been present at the Colonial Bishoprics Council on Wednesday, and to bid you

[1] Only two days before this his last departure from England, the Bishop wrote the following kind notes to the Rev. M. S. Suckling of Shipmeadow, through whom the children in the Union Workhouse in that place had sent an offering, which they had for some time been encouraged to save out of their little earnings, for the Cape Town Missions, by their schoolmaster:—

"My dear Sir . . . Will you say to the Union boys for me how glad I am to hear that they have learnt to work for Christ and His Church? It may be that they are thus laying the foundations in their own lives and characters for greater acts of self-sacrifice and love in the cause of Him Who so loved them as to give Himself for them."

And to Mr. Stammer, the boys' master, the Bishop wrote:

"I am told by your excellent Vicar that I am indebted to you for the help given by your boys to Missions in South Africa. I am glad to hear that you endeavour to lead all under your care to take an interest in the advancement of our Lord's Kingdom upon Earth. Everything we do for Him returns back with manifold blessing to ourselves. Pray tell your boys how thankfully I accept their offering. I have not a moment to write, and am overwhelmed with work."

farewell there; but I am compelled to leave town with my poor wife on that day to be ready for an early embarkation on Thursday. So I write to say good-bye. It has been amongst my great losses in England not to have been able to enjoy your society for a day, and to learn your view about matters of deep interest to the Church of God. It is probable that we shall not meet again here, though I trust hereafter. The consecration went off very well; the good Primus as kind as possible. I have a letter before the Council on Wednesday; I trust that it may be able to meet my view. I am brought into debt by what I have done for Natal, and the uncertainty as to the Bishop's income is a source of unceasing anxiety to me. Gladstone's reply to my letter is, that it was too late to interfere in the present case as to issue of letters patent;—that it might be desirable that they should not again be issued for Crown Colonies, since the Natal Judgment, and Palmer's and Coleridge's Opinion, but be 'Independent Churches like the Irish;' but that it would be 'a doubtful measure to force this liberty on weak communities, such as Sierra Leone.' In other words these Churches cannot stand alone; therefore we will force them to have letters patent, which do them no good whatever, but simply impose upon them irremovable Bishops. How clearly does all this show that the Church of England has never attempted to carry on her own Mission work! The Prime Minister says, You will have anarchy without our chains; therefore we will not release you. He knows of nothing in the Church upon which he can rely to guide and govern these infant churches. Pray have a Board, with large powers, which will regulate the Missions of the Church in accordance with the Canons and ancient precedent; and get the Bill, agreed upon by the Committee of Lambeth, of which the Archbishop was the head, and of which Gladstone approved, brought in this Session. J. Brunell, Esq., 15 Devonshire Terrace, had, with the Bishop of Graham's Town, the chief part in preparing it.

"If my correspondence with the Archbishop does nothing else, it at least reveals the wretched state in which our whole Mission work is. This subject must be taken up thoroughly,

if the greatest confusion is not to arise. All that is wanted is for the State to allow to the Church the free exercise of her religious liberties in this matter. At present ours is the only communion which is restrained by law from so simple a privilege as the consecration of our Missionary Bishops without a violation of our own Canons and usages.

"Would —— do for the very important post of Dean of Capetown? I want one who will have a grasp of a large work in a city of 30,000, with 8,000 Mahometans, 8,000 heathen, schools, orphanage, sisterhood, etc. A line to me posted on Thursday, on board 'Northam,' Plymouth, would reach me. . . . God bless, preserve, and comfort you.—Ever, my dear Brother, affectionately yours, R. CAPETOWN."

A hurried line, December 9th, told his brother and sister that the Bishop had taken his poor wife to Plymouth without any extra suffering, although the great cold of that winter, which had already set in, made travelling a risk. "She has borne everything well. I have not known her for a long time so free from pain. Our parting love to all near and dear." The voyage was trying. The Bishop wrote:

"December 17th, 1870.

"My dear Edward—We have commenced our voyage very sadly. The morning after we left Plymouth the wind became foul, and soon grew to a severe gale in our teeth. When the sea was at the highest on the 13th we had two men washed overboard. Though steaming hard we were not going more than one knot an hour, and immediately backing the engine, kept close to the poor fellows till they went down. Ropes and buoys were flung close to them, but they could not reach them. They have both left widows and children, for whom we have made a subscription. I have never had so sad a beginning. We have lost two, if not three, days already. In twenty-four hours we made about thirty miles. The ship has of course been knocked about, and been uncomfortable, but we are all right now, with a fair wind, and shall probably reach Madeira to-morrow afternoon. I need scarce say that Sophy

has been as calm and tranquil as usual, making the best of everything. The heavy rolling has fatigued her, but on the whole she has not suffered. She has slept well, and not had great pains. Her appetite, too, has improved. She has not left her berth, but has dressed every day. We were disposed to quarrel with the arrangements of the cabin, but the junction of the two berths has been a comfort to her, as she can move from one to the other. Charlie was somewhat ill, but is himself again. Tell Annie we are going to begin upon her champagne to-day. It was very wicked of her to take away my character in this way! We have a very respectable set of passengers. Many who have chest complaints will leave at Madeira. They have not by any means yet got over their sickness; but such as are well enough are very punctual in their attendance at daily prayers, and we are very harmonious. I always tell them at the beginning of each voyage after dinner that we ought, while together, to live as much as possible as one family; and that nothing will do more to bind us together than family prayer. I am able to do my reading in spite of cold, bad weather, as on other voyages. . . . I am already very weary of the voyage; but I have nothing save the dear wife's state to make me very anxious, as on so many other occasions."

To Mrs. WILLIAMSON.

"Off S. Helena, January 3rd, 1871.

"My dearest Annie—Some of you will expect a letter from S. Helena. We have had a very quiet time since we left Madeira,—trade wind all the way. The dearest wife suffered a good deal from the heat on the line and on each side, but it has done her no serious harm. She has for the last week been most mercifully spared nearly all pain, for which I am very thankful. She gets upon deck after prayers, 10.30; comes down for a nap at 3.30; up again before 6 o'clock, and remains on deck till 8 P.M. She thinks herself weaker than when she embarked, but I do not. . . . For the last week and more Sophy has been enjoying the champagne which your love and thoughtfulness put on board. . . . I have got through an

immense amount of reading. These two voyages in the past year have given me more time for study than I often get. I like my ladies very well." [1]

To Edward Gray, Esq.

"Bishop's Court, January 17th, 1871.

"Thank God we have reached home in safety. Sophy suffered much pain all the way from S. Helena, and acute agony in the drive out here. She enjoys greatly the perfect still of this place, and the singing of the birds, and the comforts around her. She will now, I believe, sink gradually to her rest. I think she is weaker than when we left home. I find plenty of troubles here. . . . Glover has made up his mind to come and live with me, but he must return to George for the present. Thus I have both Dean and Archdeacon to look for. There are many other worries, but I will not trouble you with them."

The Bishop struggled on with his work conscientiously and earnestly, but his heart was sore at the daily watching of pain in her, to save whose suffering he would have borne anything himself so gladly. He writes to his sister:

"March 2nd, 1871.

"I am in the midst of an examination of candidates for Holy Orders, and to-morrow will be taken up with *viva voce* work; so I write a line to-day to say that there is no great change in the dearest wife as regards strength. She is not weaker; but she is now hardly ever free from pain, and she sleeps worse, and is very restless. . . . I am craving for more Sisters, and to hear of the appointment of a new Dean. I think it pretty certain that we shall lose the Bishop of Graham's Town, and that Merriman will succeed him. I get very cheering letters from Bishop Macrorie. . . . Our ladies' school will begin after Easter. I have taken a very large house for it for a year. We are more likely to be inundated than to be left without pupils."

[1] Some recruits for S. George's Home whom the Bishop was taking out.

To Mrs. Mowbray.

"Bishop's Court, March 18th, 1871.

"My dearest Lizzie—This is perhaps the only letter I shall write to the family by this mail. My dearest wife still lives, but it is a life of unceasing suffering. Her moaning when she thinks none can hear is very distressing. She is now never easy, though at times without much pain. . . . She is, as ever, most patient and resigned, and 'would not wish it to be otherwise than it is.' She will hardly let me read to her, which soothes her very much, for fear of interrupting my work. I think that when the time comes she will be thankful, though her anxiety about me makes her willing to stay. A few days ago I thought her sinking rapidly; her symptoms were worse, and the pain exhausting. I do not now think that the end will be so soon. . . . We have heard, *vid* Mauritius, of the capitulation of Paris. Alas for poor France! I hold that this is clearly a chastisement for accumulated sin, as Nebuchadnezzar's capture of Jerusalem, or the Roman destruction of it. May *we* learn in time. I believe our treatment of the Education question, ousting God out of our schools and universities, forbidding teachers to make known Him, and His nature and attributes, and dealings with His children as revealed by Himself, is a great national sin, and will, unless repented of, draw down future punishment. I should not be surprised, if I live, to see the chastiser in turn chastised, as Nebuchadnezzar was, for God's judgments are upon the earth now as ever. We have nothing new here. Diamonds still found, but most unsuccessful. I do not see how we are to provide these 20,000 scattered souls with means of grace. They are not giving £100 a year to support their minister. Those who find get away, the beggars alone seem to remain. . . . We have had one village nearly washed away by a waterspout—our mission school is gone."

"April 16th.

"This is the first morning that dearest Sophy has, through great pain, been compelled to keep her bed till I came back

from church, and leave her children during the hour of dinner. Death, save for an interference which we may not look for, is fast approaching. But at Easter tide we ought not to repine at this. She is patient and submissive as ever. I read to her and pray with her daily, but she is ever afraid of taking up my moments, and throwing back my work. There are many signs, I think, of growing influence through the Church. We are now about to discuss the possibilities of union with the Dutch Church. I doubt whether it can be effected, but I think that under any circumstances good will arise to the Church."

On April 22nd, writing to the Bishop of Bombay, the Bishop says: "Ere I hear from you again, I shall, I fear, have lost what I have ever called 'my chiefest of my many blessings.' Well—God's Will be done."

Matters continued thus, and the end still did not seem very near, when on April 19th their son, Charles Gray, left the Cape to return to his parish at home. But that very night the last crisis came on. The Bishop's own account was as follows:

"Bishop's Court, April 28th, 1871.

"My dearest Charlie—It will be a shock to you to hear that your dear mother has been called away. Within a few hours of your leaving, at eleven o'clock that night, great pain came on. The night was passed in moaning. She sank to rest at seven o'clock yesterday evening. On Saturday I became very uneasy, and soon after her powers of attention failed. She continued getting worse. During all Wednesday and Thursday she was in a state of coma, taking nothing, and keeping her eyes closed. Her last words were in reply to my question, 'Darling, are you in pain?' 'Yes, dearie.' But she did not speak, I think, for the last thirty-six hours. I do not think that much before this she took in what I said, or heard my prayers. Nothing could be more tender than her tone towards me during these dreadful eight days. She thought during her whole illness, I believe, more of and for me than of herself. It is a great comfort to have been able to return some little of her tender care of me, and love for me. Bessie and I were with her throughout. I never saw greater devotion and

love than she has shown—her energies never flagged night or day. The dear children are calm, loving, attentive. Edward Glover came on Saturday, in time for her to recognise him. He is a great comfort to me. How remarkable that on the very day you left she should have become worse. You would have been glad to be present to help at this sad time. I am well. God will, I believe, support me. But none but myself know what she has been to me.

"April 30th.—We buried your dear mother yesterday in Claremont Cemetery, under the shadow of our unfinished parish church, of which she was the architect, and in which she took so deep an interest. We removed her yet open coffin, after morning prayers, into the chapel; then we had the service from the Priests' Prayer Book for the friends of the departed; then Holy Communion. I think that we never so realised the Communion of Saints before,—our dear one departed, and yet with us. Nothing could be more sweet or calm than her expression after so many days and nights of suffering. She seemed to be telling us of her rest, and peace, and joy. Bessie[1] and Fanny and I laid her out. It was very trying for us all, but we were enabled to do it. Her coffin was of polished teak, with a long brass cross the whole length. The Sisters sent a beautiful cross of flowers. When her mind was beginning to wander she said, 'Have you written to Charlie?' I said, 'You know he has only just left.' She replied, 'It will be better for him not to know till he reaches home.'"

To his sister the Bishop wrote:

"April 28, 1871.

My dearest Annie—You will look for a line to tell you how I bear the sorrow with which God has afflicted me, for my darling went to her rest yesterday evening. . . . Thank God I am calm and well, and I trust supported by God. It has even been a relief to see that dear patient sufferer no longer in agony. For some time past her pains have been increasing, but I saw nothing to make me think that she would not be

[1] Bessie Simpson, now Mrs. M'Owan, who had lived some thirty years with the Bishop and Mrs. Gray.

with us for some months to come. She herself was, I think, desirous of her release, for the poor body was sorely tried. I have many blessings left; the dear children are loving, and anxious to do all they can. God spared me family afflictions during the many anxious years when contending in the Church for principles. The loss of her at that time would have crushed me. Now public anxieties are not what they were. This sorrow, however, is a very great one, and will not easily pass away. She entered with the deepest interest, and a keen intelligence, and a sound judgment, into all the questions in which I have had to bear a part. She was identified with me and all my plans and pursuits as none other could be, and was my counsellor and helpmate. I must needs therefore feel more than many others in my circumstances would." . . .

Writing to Mrs. Mowbray on the same day, the Bishop says: "It was not her nature to talk much of her spiritual life; she had done this, however, freely to me, months ago. It was well that I knew it, for she could not in the last few days respond to anything, or even understand what I said to her. None whom I know strove more to discipline themselves, and bring the soul and the will into subjection to the Will of God."

A letter from the Bishop to Miss Mackenzie, written May 1st, gives some further touching particulars.

"Your warm heart," it says, "will feel for us when you hear that my dearest wife has been taken to her rest. She had been suffering more pain and getting weaker for some time. On the night of the 19th, the day on which Charlie left us to return to England, she became much worse. For eight days and nights she continued in a very sad state, sinking at last into coma. Her mind began to wander before we could believe her to be in any immediate danger. Her work of preparation, however, was carried on through life. For more than a year she was satisfied that she could not recover, and she was ready when the call came. You know what a noble soul was hers, and still is, and how she toiled and sacrificed herself to help on God's Work in this land. None but myself can tell what she was to me.

In all my troubles she ever counselled the strict line of duty at whatever sacrifice, and she was ready to bear her share. She would have been a martyr, if called to suffer unto death. . . . Bessie or I was with her from the hour when she was stricken, and we laid her out. I did not think that I could have done this; but she would have done more for me. Her tenderness and love throughout her sickness were most touching."

In spite of all his gentle trustful submission, the wound was a very deep one. It was no ordinary bond between those two hearts; and the survivor was as a tree, the roots of which are loosened by the fall of one from its side. The gentle pathos of all the Bishop's letters at this time is most touching. He writes:

"Ascension Eve, 1871.

"My dearest Charlie . . . . We are all well, and going on with our daily avocations. The dear children are as loving and thoughtful as they could be. The going through all your dear mother's papers and accounts has been very trying, but now it is almost over. All her writings, etc., have brought touchingly before me her unwearied labour for the Church, her care and thoughtfulness.

"I am often upset when alone, but not so hysterical as at first. I try in public to be as cheerful as I can, but at times I am unable to shake off my deep depression. I never realised so forcibly what the *pœnum damni* must be. I mean that I did not think that the loss of God's Presence must cause unutterable woe. I see now, from my present suffering, in some small measure what the misery must be of never being permitted to see the Face or joy in the Presence of Him Who is Love. I trust the effect of my chastisement may be to lead me to live nearer to God, and more for Him. Of course I desire to do all I can for the dear children, but I cannot feel the same interest in life, or in things around me (at least not at present), as I did before she was taken from me. I feel now how insufficiently I prized her,—how little I deserved to have her for thirty-four years,—how much more I ought to have done during my whole married life in the way of converse about the highest and holiest subjects.

I think that I did all I could for her during her illness, and I shall never forget the inexpressible tenderness of her tones. Her voice grew in pathos whenever she spoke to me, as the end drew nigh. How terrible would it be if I could not think of her as now in Paradise! I never knew till now how closely we were bound together. I suppose very few wives have ever so identified themselves with their husbands' work, and taken so large a share in it. I am sure none ever urged more than she the very highest course of action, involving the greatest sacrifice, when the line of duty had to be decided upon. With her I felt that I could have been happy anywhere. I never wished for other society when I could have hers. But why should I pour all this out to you? Chiefly, I suppose, because I cannot do so to others.

"I am going to take the children with me on Monday for a four days' change, while I am confirming at the Paarl, Wellington, etc. I hope to send them over Bain's Kloof. Edward is as good and gentle as he can be. I am trembling lest the next mail with the Bishop of Bloemfontein and a party of eleven, and then my new Dean and Archdeacon, should be put into quarantine.[1]—Ever, my dearest boy, your most affectionate father, R. CAPETOWN."

"I try to go on with my usual work and to be cheerful," the Bishop wrote (May 17th) to his brother, "but her form is ever before me, and everything leads back to her. . . . I must soon make a Visitation, but I dread it, for there is not a nook or corner in this land,—not a farmhouse at which I shall touch, or a view at which I shall look, but what will be associated with her, and bring back the past. That which made the rough places smooth, and every difficulty and discomfort tolerable, was her cheerful happy contentment. I did not know till I lost her how wrapped up I was in her, though I used never to want any other if I had her, and was never so happy as when alone with her. Well, my dear fellow, I trust that the separation is but for a while. If I had not comfort in the

[1] There had been quarantine on account of smallpox lately.

thought of her present state, I should be very unhappy. But there is an aching void, a yearning for her presence, which I endeavour to check. I preached yesterday at Claremont. I have been to examine a Mission School to-day, and to see a good pious woman who is afflicted in the same way, for whom my dearest felt keenly, contrasting her own comforts with this poor soul's needs. She sent me to see her, and pray with her, and provide for her wants."

"Ascension Day, 1871. We are going on much as my darling would have done, if I had been taken and she left, *i.e.* doing in quietness and as cheerfully as we can the work God has given us to do. The girls, I think, go more among the poor coloured people around us, among whom there has been sickness, and take great interest in their night school from 6 to 8.30 three times a week, and rise up to their new duties in the house. They are very tender and loving, but you know how fondly the memory dwells upon the one who has been to us more than all the world besides, and how no other earthly affection compensates for the loss of that one. Well, the world henceforth will be another world to me. Only may God give me grace to live while in it to Him. . . . On Monday I take the dear children out with me for four days' confirmation—they need a little change. After that I shall have to receive the Bishop of Bloemfontein, then my new Dean and Archdeacon; and so soon as the weather will admit of it, I shall have to go to Namaqua Land, or over the rest of the Diocese, both of which journeys I dread. I am quite well, save that my nights are broken. . . . People all through this land know how my dearest laboured for the Church, and express themselves very kindly. May we both, dearest Annie, join our loved ones in God's good time in Paradise, and may I be able to turn, as you have done, God's chastisement to good account, and be cheerful under it as you are. I shall need your prayers for this."

To Miss Mackenzie.

"Bishop's Court, May 19th, 1871.

. . . "I am, thank God, tolerably well, going on with my

work as my darling would have done hers, if I had been first taken. I know that I dearly loved her, but I never knew how entirely I was wrapped up in her until now. Her image is ever before me. I could not wish to bring her back to her sufferings, for they were very great, though most meekly borne. One of her last sayings before the final attack came on was, 'Dearest, you would not wish to keep me amid so much suffering, would you?' But I must not dwell on these things. . . . This life can never again be to me what it has been. I used to tell her that she was the chiefest of my many blessings, and that with her for a companion I could live anywhere happily, even in a Kafir hut. I believe an attempt is going to be made to complete Claremont Church as a memorial to the dearest wife, who was its architect and foundress, and now lies under its shadow."

To Edward Gray, Esq.

"Bishop's Court, June 14th, 1871.

"I write a line by a stray steamer to say that we are all well. Everything is going on much as if my darling were still with us, only it is with a heavy heart that I go about my work. I had hoped this time last year that, now that my chief public troubles and contests were apparently over, we might have a little quite time together in the evening of life, with more leisure than heretofore. I now see that we should have taken up our rest here. It is in mercy and love I doubt not that she has been taken to the true Rest, and I, who most needed it, have received a call, which I pray God I may answer, and suffer to work its work within me. It has already, more than all other things that have happened to me, weaned me from this world, and made me anxious to prepare myself so as to be fit to be with her in God's good time. . . . I have since I last wrote been immersed for days together in accounts. It is not easy to take up another's system, and these accounts are most marvellously complicated, embracing as they do so many distinct funds, and £50,000 being in mortgages most irregularly paid, and being constantly changed. . . . I hope that Edward

and I together have got all clear at last. The poor Bishop of Bloemfontein is still at Saldanha Bay (in quarantine) with his party of nineteen. A second case of smallpox occurred, and they will not be released till the 22nd.

"I am expecting Archdeacon Fogg in the 'Cambrian' every hour. The Bishop of Graham's Town will, I suppose, leave in July.

To the Same.

"S. Peter's Day, 1871.

. . . "The Bishop of Bloemfontein and his party are here, Archdeacon Fogg, and the Dean with his governess and little boys. I can hardly work myself up to the necessary amount of talk. The aching void is as keenly felt as ever. Life is not what it was, and will never be so again. It is very difficult to feel an interest in anything.

"S. P. G. has reduced our grant by another £100. I have placed before the Dutch Church authorities a large scheme for union of Churches. They have had it before them a month, but have not yet sent their answer. We are, I fear, too different to be united in one Church. . . . I install the new Dean (Rev. C. W. Barnett-Clarke) publicly during Divine service on Sunday. We have a short special service after the First Lesson."

"July 18th, 1871.

"The Bishop of Graham's Town and Mrs. Cotterill are now with us on their way home to take up the work in Edinburgh. I shall miss his strong sense and ripened views, especially in the Provincial Synod, if spared to see another. . . . I am well, at times tossed to and fro, but in the main cheerful. I would give I know not what, if it were God's Will, to have my darling back again. I suppose that had she been spared to this time when my great ecclesiastical struggles seem over, and the Church is in peace, life would have been too happy, and we should have taken up our rest here, and I should have clung to the creature rather than to the Creator. I would have nothing otherwise than as God wills. All I care for now is to be fitted, when my time comes, to be with her at our dear

Lord's Feet. There is much, very much, to be wrought in me and rooted out of me, before this will be."

To the BISHOP of BOMBAY.

"August 10th, 1871.

. . . "I need not tell you of the aching void, the yearning and the longing, the depression, the impossibility of bringing the mind into the state in which it ought to be. She had identified herself with all my work. I took counsel with her, and we shared each other's thoughts. I cannot but mourn, while bowing, I trust, submissively to God's Will. Do what I will, there is ever the under-current of thought about her. You and your dear wife know what a noble-minded woman she was, how she ever took the highest view of duty, how she watched and cared for me. . . . There have been some very strong expressions of feeling towards her, both here and in England. . . . In time I hope that I may attain to cheerfulness, but the pangs of separation cut very deep. May you, my dear friends, be spared them for many a day. I have not been very well of late, chiefly, I think, because the mind has been telling upon the body."

It was certainly with a saddened, but nevertheless with a brave heart that the Bishop worked on, and so far from indulging any ideas of turning to England for rest and quiet during the few years at longest likely to be his, he accepted Africa more than ever as his earthly home, and as the place where God would have him be. This is strongly put forward in a letter to his brother, who had expressed a natural wish that the remainder of his bereaved life might be spent among those left of the once large, now very diminished family, who all loved him so deeply. The wonderful humility of the writer is most touching:

"Bishop's Court, July 18th, 1871.

"My dear Edward . . . The Bishop of Bloemfontein went up through the Karroo, and has been stopped by snow about 400 miles off, a thing which the inhabitants had not seen for twenty-four years. Ours is a very fine winter. You pro-

pose to me to abandon my work here, and go to England. I have ever thought an English country parish the happiest abode and sphere of labour for a Clergyman, and I did not leave my Mother Church or Mother land to please myself. We both felt the summons to come out here to be a call. I have never doubted that it was. The work done is, I think, generally felt to show this. I am still quite as equal to the duties of my office as when my darling was with me to help and comfort me. What plea should I have for resigning? It seems to me that my doing so would be sinful. At present I am useful here —more so, perhaps, than I have ever been. The finishing of many battles has been followed by general respect and confidence. So far as I can see, the Church is getting day by day a greater hold upon this country. At this moment we have no troubles or controversies of any kind. The greatest religious body in the country is considering on what terms it can unite with us. I know full well how suddenly all this may be changed—we are in the Church militant, not the Church triumphant. Difficulties may be in store, which one who feels himself shattered may be unequal to cope with; or health may give way; or spiritually, I may become, through Satan's assaults, unfit for my post, and feel it a duty to retire. But I think that I shall end my days here, so far as I can see; and it is my hope that my bones may be laid beside the bones of her who was and is so precious to me. I can hardly at times feel that she is gone, and I half expect to see her, and so, I trust, I shall in God's good time, but not here. I have a great deal yet to learn, and there is a great deal to be wrought in me, and there are many hindrances. My inward battles had, so far as I can see, better be fought out here, where my outer battles with the powers of darkness have been fought. Pray for me, my dear brother, but do not think about change of worldly circumstances. I never was, I think, ambitious. I certainly ought not to be so, and, I trust, am not so now. My dearest ever felt with me the wish to be only where God would have us be. With her I could have been happy anywhere, for she made the best of everything, and was ever bright and contented

and cheerful. I must try to be happy, where God has placed me, without her; and I should be so, but for the remains of sin with me. The rest of my life must be given mainly to the struggle with the evil that is in me, and the assaults of the Evil One, who has, I think, since I have been left alone, assailed me more vehemently than before. Perhaps after, by God's Grace, I am strengthened, I shall be more useful to my people. I have long felt that my Episcopate was too much taken up with external work. You may have heard me complain of being compelled for so many years to serve tables. Perhaps a little time may yet be spared me for purely spiritual work."

No, there was certainly no slackening in energy at his work, with however saddened a spirit it might often have to be done; and no diminution of the Bishop's keen interest, in all that touched the Church's welfare. He wrote to his son:

"August 1st, 1871.

. . . "I feel my state of widowhood more and more. Nothing in this world can compensate for the loss of her, for none else can ever be to me what she was. I am very much like one of our wrecked ships. Nothing can be nicer than the children and Edward. . . . I like all that I see of ——. I do not feel very uneasy about the Ritualists.[1] I think the remonstrance of the 5,000 has really won for them the day. The Bishop of London tells me that he thinks Parliament would have interfered if the Judgment had been different. I do not think so. The Court of Privy Council has lost its weight. Its judgments have *throughout* been so one-sided, and based upon expediency, that it can never again command respect. How the Bishops *can* go on scolding these poor Ritualists, and bidding them obey the law, while they never think of obeying it themselves, and are quite content that the Evangelicals should set it at defiance in a hundred ways, I confess I do not understand!"

The Bishop wrote to Archdeacon Thomas:

"Ely, October 31st, 1867.

"The state of the Church generally, so far as I can see, is

[1] Alluding to the Purchas Judgment.

pose to me to abandon my work here, and go to England. I have ever thought an English country parish the happiest abode and sphere of labour for a Clergyman, and I did not leave my Mother Church or Mother land to please myself. We both felt the summons to come out here to be a call. I have never doubted that it was. The work done is, I think, generally felt to show this. I am still quite as equal to the duties of my office as when my darling was with me to help and comfort me. What plea should I have for resigning? It seems to me that my doing so would be sinful. At present I am useful here —more so, perhaps, than I have ever been. The finishing of many battles has been followed by general respect and confidence. So far as I can see, the Church is getting day by day a greater hold upon this country. At this moment we have no troubles or controversies of any kind. The greatest religious body in the country is considering on what terms it can unite with us. I know full well how suddenly all this may be changed—we are in the Church militant, not the Church triumphant. Difficulties may be in store, which one who feels himself shattered may be unequal to cope with; or health may give way; or spiritually, I may become, through Satan's assaults, unfit for my post, and feel it a duty to retire. But I think that I shall end my days here, so far as I can see; and it is my hope that my bones may be laid beside the bones of her who was and is so precious to me. I can hardly at times feel that she is gone, and I half expect to see her, and so, I trust, I shall in God's good time, but not here. I have a great deal yet to learn, and there is a great deal to be wrought in me, and there are many hindrances. My inward battles had, so far as I can see, better be fought out here, where my outer battles with the powers of darkness have been fought. Pray for me, my dear brother, but do not think about change of worldly circumstances. I never was, I think, ambitious. I certainly ought not to be so, and, I trust, am not so now. My dearest ever felt with me the wish to be only where God would have us be. With her I could have been happy anywhere, for she made the best of everything, and was ever bright and contented

and cheerful. I must try to be happy, where God has placed me, without her; and I should be so, but for the remains of sin with me. The rest of my life must be given mainly to the struggle with the evil that is in me, and the assaults of the Evil One, who has, I think, since I have been left alone, assailed me more vehemently than before. Perhaps after, by God's Grace, I am strengthened, I shall be more useful to my people. I have long felt that my Episcopate was too much taken up with external work. You may have heard me complain of being compelled for so many years to serve tables. Perhaps a little time may yet be spared me for purely spiritual work."

No, there was certainly no slackening in energy at his work, with however saddened a spirit it might often have to be done; and no diminution of the Bishop's keen interest, in all that touched the Church's welfare. He wrote to his son:

"August 1st, 1871.

. . . "I feel my state of widowhood more and more. Nothing in this world can compensate for the loss of her, for none else can ever be to me what she was. I am very much like one of our wrecked ships. Nothing can be nicer than the children and Edward. . . . I like all that I see of ——. I do not feel very uneasy about the Ritualists.[1] I think the remonstrance of the 5,000 has really won for them the day. The Bishop of London tells me that he thinks Parliament would have interfered if the Judgment had been different. I do not think so. The Court of Privy Council has lost its weight. Its judgments have *throughout* been so one-sided, and based upon expediency, that it can never again command respect. How the Bishops *can* go on scolding these poor Ritualists, and bidding them obey the law, while they never think of obeying it themselves, and are quite content that the Evangelicals should set it at defiance in a hundred ways, I confess I do not understand!"

The Bishop wrote to Archdeacon Thomas:

"Ely, October 31st, 1867.

"The state of the Church generally, so far as I can see, is

[1] Alluding to the Purchas Judgment.

satisfactory. We are holding our own against dissent, but not absorbing it. There is development, I think, and life everywhere, and less bitterness, I should hope. There is, however, a deepening life within the Church, and certainly the mind of the Church is going in strongly for hearty services and a moderate ritual. I do not myself like *ultra*-ritualism, but I do not believe that these men are untrue to the Church of England; and I believe that they might be guided if they were dealt fairly with, and sympathy shown to them."

To the BISHOP of BOMBAY.

"April 22, 1871.

. . . "You will be as sick as I am of this wretched persecution of the Ritualists. If I had not been so much in collision with the powers that be, I think that I should have joined in some public protestation. I think the course is—

"I. To call upon the Bishops, before they exercise discipline, to obey fully the Church's laws themselves.

"II. To insist upon *all* being required to obey these laws, or *none*.

"III. That if obedience cannot be exacted of the gentlemen of the Church Association, to allow a latitude to their opponents.

"The one-sidedness and partiality in the administration of the affairs of the Church is to me most shocking and revolting. . . . I hope you will fight for more Bishops in India."

Just at the same time (April 19, 1871), Bishop Wilberforce writes from Sandringham:

. . . "You will know almost as much as I can tell you of home affairs. The letters of the Archbishop are most unfortunate, and do us a vast amount of harm. But I think every attack on any part of Catholic belief or practice calls forth an answer which shows the widening area of faith, and the deeper earnestness with which those who hold it at all, do hold it. I rather incline to think that the issue of the last judgment will be a general adoption of the surplice and of copes in cathedrals, and the celebrant standing where he and his people choose.

The Madagascar Bishopric question is far from over. I *hope*, in spite of —— and ——, that S. P. G. will persevere, and it is shaking C. M. S. to its foundations, and calling out a new spirit in its supporters, who are sick of being Venn-ridden." . . .

The Bishop might well say he did not "understand!" His large generous nature could never see the right or meaning of any evasion, or press any yoke upon others which he was not ready first to bear himself. As already said, he was certainly not a Ritualist in the then acceptance of the word. He had strong convictions as to what was right, and no one who knew him could for a moment question that he was a true and hearty Catholic, but he had a marvellous fund of consideration and tenderness for others. His own habit and liking, *e.g.*, was to celebrate before the altar; and when he received the Purchas Judgment, he wrote that he "was sorry for it, but should make no change."

"We are not very ritualistic here," he wrote (April 29th, 1870), "but, by giving time to people to be accustomed to changes, as, *e.g.*, celebration with face to the altar, they are quite reconciled to our proceedings." He always pleaded for patience and forbearance, and for going quietly and gently on, even in introducing what he held to be right. "You will remember," he writes to his son, soon after he went to Helmsley, "that a parish church is in a different position from most ritualistic churches, which have their special congregations, attracted by the very services which repel others. . . . Everything in these matters depends upon what people can bear. It is infinitely better to go slowly than to have a great row, which will throw everything back." . . .

And again: "I need not urge you to be gentle with the Methodists. By your account it is zeal that has led to their multiplied ministrations. Hearty services, if changes are not made too rapidly, will attract and absorb the population. I should say, Be slow in all your movements. Let there be a gradual preparation of men's minds. If not, you will throw back your work, and have disappointments, which perhaps would not otherwise have arisen."

satisfactory. We are holding our own against dissent, but not absorbing it. There is development, I think, and life everywhere, and less bitterness, I should hope. There is, however, a deepening life within the Church, and certainly the mind of the Church is going in strongly for hearty services and a moderate ritual. I do not myself like *ultra*-ritualism, but I do not believe that these men are untrue to the Church of England; and I believe that they might be guided if they were dealt fairly with, and sympathy shown to them."

To the BISHOP of BOMBAY.

"April 22, 1871.

. . . "You will be as sick as I am of this wretched persecution of the Ritualists. If I had not been so much in collision with the powers that be, I think that I should have joined in some public protestation. I think the course is—

"I. To call upon the Bishops, before they exercise discipline, to obey fully the Church's laws themselves.

"II. To insist upon *all* being required to obey these laws, or *none*.

"III. That if obedience cannot be exacted of the gentlemen of the Church Association, to allow a latitude to their opponents.

"The one-sidedness and partiality in the administration of the affairs of the Church is to me most shocking and revolting. . . . I hope you will fight for more Bishops in India."

Just at the same time (April 19, 1871), Bishop Wilberforce writes from Sandringham:

. . . "You will know almost as much as I can tell you of home affairs. The letters of the Archbishop are most unfortunate, and do us a vast amount of harm. But I think every attack on any part of Catholic belief or practice calls forth an answer which shows the widening area of faith, and the deeper earnestness with which those who hold it at all, do hold it. I rather incline to think that the issue of the last judgment will be a general adoption of the surplice and of copes in cathedrals, and the celebrant standing where he and his people choose.

The Madagascar Bishopric question is far from over. I *hope*, in spite of —— and ——, that S. P. G. will persevere, and it is shaking C. M. S. to its foundations, and calling out a new spirit in its supporters, who are sick of being Venn-ridden." . . .

The Bishop might well say he did not "understand!" His large generous nature could never see the right or meaning of any evasion, or press any yoke upon others which he was not ready first to bear himself. As already said, he was certainly not a Ritualist in the then acceptance of the word. He had strong convictions as to what was right, and no one who knew him could for a moment question that he was a true and hearty Catholic, but he had a marvellous fund of consideration and tenderness for others. His own habit and liking, *e.g.*, was to celebrate before the altar; and when he received the Purchas Judgment, he wrote that he "was sorry for it, but should make no change."

"We are not very ritualistic here," he wrote (April 29th, 1870), "but, by giving time to people to be accustomed to changes, as, *e.g.*, celebration with face to the altar, they are quite reconciled to our proceedings." He always pleaded for patience and forbearance, and for going quietly and gently on, even in introducing what he held to be right. "You will remember," he writes to his son, soon after he went to Helmsley, "that a parish church is in a different position from most ritualistic churches, which have their special congregations, attracted by the very services which repel others. . . . Everything in these matters depends upon what people can bear. It is infinitely better to go slowly than to have a great row, which will throw everything back." . . .

And again: "I need not urge you to be gentle with the Methodists. By your account it is zeal that has led to their multiplied ministrations. Hearty services, if changes are not made too rapidly, will attract and absorb the population. I should say, Be slow in all your movements. Let there be a gradual preparation of men's minds. If not, you will throw back your work, and have disappointments, which perhaps would not otherwise have arisen."

Again: "You will, I hope, *festina lente* in your new field. I do not know what sort of a man your predecessor was, but probably he did not pave the way for your teaching. I often pity congregations which have a succession of pastors of different views. It must be very trying to them, specially as regards ritual, as to which they are more sensitive than doctrine. Give them a little breathing time, and introduce changes gradually."

To a young Clergyman who had asked the Bishop's advice as to habitually wearing his cassock, he replied: "I think that you would do wisely not to wear it while people are wholly unaccustomed to it, and confound it with Rome. We have no right in these excitable days to shock and startle people who do not know us. For a year or two, if all goes on well, you will be able to do what you like in this matter without putting a stumblingblock in a brother's way, and causing him to offend. If the church is near, I see no objection to your walking to it in your cassock, but I think I should not *at first* wear it all day in the house."

To a question as to going into society, the Bishop wrote: "I should say dine with your Squire whenever he asked you, if it did not interfere with some plain duty. It is of great importance that you should be on easy terms with him, and it is a great thing to interest him and his in your plans, and teach them in Church matters, which can be best done in an evening. I should also dine out with neighbouring Clergy, and drink tea with the tradesmen. I am persuaded that it is better not to shut yourself up in your shell, but to mix socially in a moderate way with all who are around you. It is better for your own mind to be taken off from the incessant routine of parish work, —and *you* may become narrow in solitude as well as others. S. Paul's rule should be weighed, 'All things to all men;' 'Servant of the Lord, gentle to all men,' etc. It is in the putting self and temper entirely aside that you may best hope for success."

Early in the year 1869 the Bishop's son had published a pamphlet on the subject of Confession, containing a catena of English divines, proving that the doctrine and practice of con-

fession both essentially belong to the Church of England, and have never been discarded or denied. On receiving the *Statement* (as the first edition was called: it is now printed under the title of *Confession as taught in the Church of England*) the Bishop wrote to his son:

"Beaufort, March 31st, 1869.

"Your *Statement* reached me at Prince Albert, where I was on Good Friday and Easter Day. I think that you have stated your case well, and unexceptionably and moderately. Neither the Bishop, nor any one calling himself a Churchman, can justly find fault with you, writing as you do reverently and devoutly."

A little later in the same year, when Mr. Gray was presented to the Vicarage of Helmsley, in Yorkshire, he wrote a full expression of his opinions on the subject of the Blessed Sacrament to the gentleman who offered it to him; and as it was his wont to consult his father in every step, a copy of the letter was sent to him. Bishop Gray acknowledges this, January 30th, 1870, saying, "I quite concur not only in your views on the Holy Eucharist, so far as you have unfolded them, but in your course in putting them frankly before ——."[1]

In the beginning of the year 1869 some parishioners of

[1] "S. John Baptist, Kidderminster, December 21st, 1869.

"My dear —— . . . As regards the Holy Eucharist . . . I should maintain that in a Sacrament there are two parts: (1) a part we *can* see; (2) a part we *cannot* see. In the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper we have: I. 'The outward visible sign,' or part we *can* see, which is Bread and Wine; II. The inward part (or 'thing' which is 'signified' by the bread and wine), which we *cannot* see—the Body and Blood of Christ. In accordance with this, *as* I believe the outward part, Bread and Wine, to be always really and truly there, *so* I believe the Body and Blood of Christ to be really and truly there present as the inward part 'verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful' (*i.e.* baptized people cf. Article xix. and Collect 21 and 25 after Trinity) 'in the Lord's Supper.' To take away the *Outward Part* of Bread and Wine (as the Romanist would do) declaring it transubstantiated, or changed into flesh and blood, is, I believe, unscriptural, unprimitive, and 'overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament,' which requires two parts. To take away (as I conceive the Calvinist does) the *Inward Part* of the Body and Blood of Christ is unscriptural (since to do so you must apply the same sort of interpretation to the sixth chapter of S. John, S. Luke xxii. 19, etc. as the Socinian applies to the first chapter), and unprimitive,—overthrowing the nature of a Sacrament which requires two parts. When I say that I believe the Body and Blood of Christ to be truly present, and so 'given, taken, and eaten

S. Thomas, Malmesbury, formally complained to the Bishop of certain practices adopted by their parish priest, the Rev. W. E. Belson—*i.e.*, "I. Vestments; II. Cross; Super altar; III. Candles; and IV. Adoration after the consecration of the Eucharistic elements;" and in a second letter they further complained of the V. Mixing of water with the wine, and what they now called "adoration of the elements; VI. Of a Hymn being sung

in the Lord's Supper' (Art. xxvii.), I should be most unwilling to do what our Church has not done, viz. *define* HOW. This only I would say, that we are not to understand it in any gross, carnal way, but 'only after a heavenly and spiritual manner,' spiritually, though really and truly.

"The above view makes the 'real and essential,' though spiritual, Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ to be dependent on and a result from the consecration of the Bread and Wine by God through His appointed agent. Whereas, what I must call the semi-Calvinistic, though popular view, makes it to depend on the faith of the individual receiver. Faith is a requisite for him who would eat and drink worthily of what is already there. Again: Since we are told that '*as* the benefit is great if with a true penitent heart and lively faith we receive that Holy Sacrament, *so* is the danger great if we receive the SAME' (Sacrament with its two parts) 'unworthily, for then we are guilty of the Body and Blood of Christ our Saviour; we eat and drink our own damnation, not considering the Lord's Body.' And since we pray (in prayer of humble access) 'Grant us . . . so to eat the Flesh of Thy Dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink His Blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His Body, and our souls washed through His most Precious Blood'—(evidently fearing lest we should eat it with a different result), I believe that the wicked as well as the good do receive both the outward part (*signum*) and the thing signified (*res*) of the Sacrament, though not the '*virtus*,' *i.e.* they do not *partake*, or eat to the strengthening and refreshing of their souls, though both parts of the Sacrament be given to them. Again: I believe that adoration paid to the Sacramental Bread and Wine would be idolatry to be abhorred by all, and any adoration of any fancied Corporal Presence of Christ's Body and Blood would be erroneous,—yet I do believe that the real though spiritual Presence, mysteriously and wonderfully there, demands all due reverence and adoration, real though not necessarily demonstrative. As regards the Sacrifice in the Holy Communion, I believe only in the Sacrifice of Christ once for all offered upon the Cross never to be repeated; but I do also believe that just as He continually pleads the remembrance of that Sacrifice before the Father in Heaven, and as we in *word* at the end of every prayer plead the remembrance of that Sacrifice when we say, 'Grant us this through Jesus Christ our Lord;' so do we, as it were, in a visible prayer or act plead and present before the Father in the Holy Communion, the Blessed Sacrament as a memorial or remembrance of His Son's Death,—the most powerful way of obtaining what we desire. In short, I believe that the Lord's Supper was 'ordained for a continual ἀναμνησις, or 'remembrance' before God 'of the Sacrifice of the Death of Christ,'—as well as 'for the benefits which we receive thereby.' . . . I remain, etc. etc.

"C. N. GRAY."

immediately before the consecration; VII. Of the sign of the Cross used in the administration; VIII. Of bowing to the Cross; IX. Of coloured stoles, alb, and girdle, and the discontinuance of using the University hood, etc. Perhaps no better way of representing the Bishop's official mind and action can be adopted than by giving extracts from his reply to these documents:

I. The lawfulness of crosses as ornaments of churches, he reminds the petitioners, was determined in the case of Liddell *v.* Westerton, in 1857; "and since that judgment I believe the question has not been further agitated. They are very common, and are becoming general in churches. The material of which they are made in no way affects the question. They are made indifferently of marble, stone, wood, silver, brass. . . . Being a legal ornament, I have no right to object to it."

II. As to the super altar and candlesticks, the Court of Arches had declined to pronounce them illegal, and they must be regarded as lawful ornaments of the Church. "You are probably aware," the Bishop adds, "that the lighting of candles during the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, pronounced to be in accordance with law by the recent decision of the Court of Arches, has just been declared contrary to law by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council."

III. With respect to vestments, the Bishop remarks: "The matter has been keenly debated in England. On the one side it has been argued that the Canon of 1603 regulates this matter for parish churches, as distinct from Cathedrals; and that if the language of the Rubrics differs, the custom of the Church, from nearly the time of the Reformation, has been against the use, and that upon the principle of '*mos pro lege*' the question ought not to be regarded as an open one. On the other side it is argued that it is expressly ordered by the 24th Canon of 1603, that the cope shall be used in the celebration of Holy Communion in Cathedral churches, that these vestments have been in use in some churches down to a late period, and that they are required by the Rubric at the beginning of the Book of Common Prayer, which orders 'that such ornaments,' etc. . . . It is the true meaning and right

construction of this Rubric, which, it is agreed on all sides, must mainly govern the question as to the proper legal ornaments of churches and the other accompaniments of Divine Service in England, inasmuch as Rubrics form part of an Act of Parliament, and Canons do not. . . . However this may be, the question of vestments is not before any Court, nor apparently is it likely to be. From the Mackonochie case, lately on appeal before the Privy Council, it was deliberately omitted, probably in consequence of the strong legal opinions given by eminent counsel as to their legality. The point is fully entered into in the very interesting appendices attached to the evidence laid before the Ritual Commission. . . . Sir R. Phillimore, Sir F. Kelly, Sir W. Bovill, Mr. W. M. James, Q.C.; Dr. Dean, Sir J. D. Coleridge, Attorney-General; Mr. C. J. Prideaux, Mr. J. Hannam, Mr. J. Cutter, all held that the vestments are a legal dress."

The Bishop then refers to the different way in which Eucharistic adoration is mentioned in the two letters, remarking upon the "importance of accuracy of expression in theological questions." If Mr. Belson "adored the elements," he was of course wrong. "I do not, however, for a moment, impute this to Mr. Belson; he indeed denies it. Apparently what he does is this. After consecrating the elements he kneels as if in adoration, but saying no prayer aloud. If this be so, there is nothing to condemn in the act. Every Priest does it, before communicating himself. If at that sacred moment Mr. Belson adores his Lord, mystically and sacramentally Present in His Own appointed Feast, he is perfectly justified in doing so, nor can I, indeed, conceive how any one so circumstanced can refrain from adoration. The judge of the Court of Arches says, with reference to Mr. Mackonochie's practice in this matter: 'It is true that the Rubric does not give precise directions that the celebrant himself should kneel at the times when it appears Mr. Mackonochie does kneel, but I am very far from saying that it is not legally competent to him, as well as to other Priests and to the congregation, to adopt this attitude of devotion!'"

The Bishop goes on to consider the question of the mixed

chalice. "Mr. Belson says: 'I do mix a little water with the wine, but not in the Church and during service, and only as allowed in the late judgment in the Court of Arches.' If this be so, I have no right to find fault with him; but if you are right, and he does it at the celebration, I say, *with great reluctance,* that if the act is a cause of offence to the communicants, Mr. Belson should cease to do it. My reluctance is founded on the following considerations:—It is believed that our Lord followed the Passover practice, and used at the institution of the Holy Sacrament the mixed cup. It certainly was so used in the very first ages of the Church. Justin Martyr, the earliest of the Fathers (as Bishop Kaye observes), of whose works we possess very considerable remains, in describing the customs of the first Christians, says: 'Bread is then brought to that brother who presides, and a cup of wine MIXED WITH WATER.' So-called General Councils have ordered expressly that it should be thus mixed. The Church in Scotland mixes it to this day. Some of our own greatest champions against Roman errors—as, *e.g.,* Bishop Andrewes and Bishop Cosin—practised it in their day. Many do so in our own. It is a very simple custom, and a beautiful one if adopted as symbolical of the Water and Blood which flowed from the Saviour's Side." . . . After quoting the judgment ruling that the water may be mixed before, but not in the celebration, the Bishop goes on to say: "I unfeignedly regret that this point has been referred to me."

As to Elevation of the Eucharist: "Upon this point the Judge of the Court of Arches says 'that the original practice in England, as in other countries, had been to stir up the devotion of the people to God by the Elevation of the Blessed Sacrament;—that the Curia of Rome introduced an unwarrantable innovation upon an ancient and laudable usage,—that the act was prohibited at the Reformation,—that it is unlawful.' I have no means of judging whether Mr. Belson practises what is technically called 'elevation,' which consists in lifting the Cup above the head. If so, his practice is not sanctioned by our Church. Some kind of elevation there must be, as Dr. Phillimore has said.

"Your next objection is to the introduction of a hymn before the Consecration. There is no authority for any hymns in our Service, except after the 3rd Collect. You are aware, however, that the greatest diversities of practice prevail without restraint of authority in this matter. In some churches there is a hymn before the service, in others at the close; in some there are Processional and Recessional hymns; in some during the celebration of the Eucharist. There is a monthly choral celebration in my own Cathedral. . . . I do not feel that I have any right to interfere with the liberty of a Clergyman in this matter. The question, I venture to think wisely, is left to the discretion of the minister."

As to the sign of the Cross in communicating people, the Bishop said he did not himself like it, though he did not condemn it, but would counsel that if it offended people it should be discontinued.

With reference to "bowing to the Cross," the Bishop remarks that the petitioners should be more careful in their statements. Mr. Belson, as might be expected, stated that he "bowed his head, but not to the Cross. I make an act of reverence to Christ truly present."

"I never heard of any one bowing to the Cross," the Bishop says, "and I did not need the assurance he has given. He admits that he bows, but he shows why, and to what. Believing in our Lord's promise that where two or three are gathered together in His Name, there is He in the midst of them,—that the altar is the most sacred place in the Church, that his Lord deigns to be present there,—he bows in reverential recognition of that Presence.

"It is not my custom to do this, chiefly because I was not brought up to do so, and I have the same distaste for changes that you have, and adopt them but slowly; but I cannot condemn the practice in others. It is one of those things to which, as it seems to me, S. Paul's rule (Rom. xiv. 3, 6) especially applies. The custom prevails largely in England at this time. It has existed, as appears from the evidence given before the Royal Commission, in some at least of our Cathedrals, from time immemorial, *e.g.*, Canterbury, Durham, and I believe

Carlisle. The Convocation of 1640 in the eighth Canon 'commends to all good and well-affected people, members of this Church, that they be ready to tender unto the Lord the said acknowledgment, by doing reverence and obedience both at their coming in and going out of the said churches, according to the most ancient custom of the Primitive Church in the purest times, and of this Church also for many years of the reign of Queen Elizabeth.'"

As to coloured stoles, the Bishop said, "No one, I think, questions that they are lawful. Certainly they are not forbidden, and are largely in use. The 'white alb plain' is expressly ordered by the Rubric of Edward VI., First Book, which our present Rubric refers to. . . . I seldom wear my own University hood in church, chiefly because of the heat of the climate, and therefore I can hardly urge Mr. Belson to do so; but if his not doing so gives offence, I think he might well resume it."

In the course of some conciliatory words of counsel to all concerned before closing, the Bishop, in accordance with his wonted consideration for others, says: "I sympathize largely with those who, perhaps from childhood, have been accustomed to certain forms and modes of conducting Divine worship, and feel a dislike to changes, even though those changes may be improvements. . . . That there have of late years been great improvements in our mode of conducting it in this land, as well as in England, is patent to all. That our services are not as yet all that they ought to be, most are ready to admit. There are few more vehement opponents of Ritualism than the Bishop of S. David's, who is regarded as the most learned of our Bishops. And yet he says: 'I fully admit that our order of Morning and Evening Prayer is not in its present state adapted to the purpose of an early service, which common people even of devout habits could be expected to attend:' and again, 'I readily admit that in many of our churches there is large room for improvement in the prevailing practice of our public worship:' and again, 'We can hardly fail to see clear signs of a wide-spread feeling that something is wanting in the ordinary services of the Church to make them generally

attractive or impressive.' This feeling is shared, I believe, by very many within the Church. The desire to make our worship more hearty and more real is a healthy one. It grows, and I trust will continue to grow, for it is an indication of the deepening of devotion, and of the Divine life among us. We could not go back to the mode of worship of the last century, in which the Service was not unfrequently what has been called a duet between the minister and the clerk, without infinite loss.

"These matters are as yet far from perfect with us. So rapid and general has been the improvement in England (extending even to dissenting chapels), that whereas a few years ago we, in this land, were in advance of the ordinary parish Church, I fear that at present we are behind in what is very common." After quoting Mr. Gladstone's *Chapter of Autobiography*, and his words "Our churches and worship bore in general too conclusive testimony to a frozen indifference," the Bishop goes on to say: "Whether the Church will ever give any more minute directions for the conduct of Divine Service than the Prayer Book contains, it is impossible to say. Very many think that there should be ample room for the diversities of men's tastes and views;—that in some churches there should not only be choral services, but an elaborate ceremonial; while in others, if desired, there should be services of the simplest and even baldest kind. I lean myself to this opinion, considering the state of men's feelings as a solution of existing difficulties, for congregations often urge on changes more than Clergy;—but whatever may ultimately be authorised, our present duty is to bear and forbear."

But to return to what were indeed now the Bishop's last days. In spite of all his brave exertions, his body had always been far too readily affected by whatever distressed his spirit not to suffer now, and he was obliged to own (August 4th, 1871) that he was not well. "The mind tells upon the body, and the body in turn reacts upon the mind," he wrote. "I have had a good deal of mental struggle and trial. . . . The girls have now in charge twenty-five patients in fever.[1] They take them four bottles of

[1] Black people on his own and neighbouring estates.

wine, with a great infusion of quinine, daily. Had it not been for them, and the food we have given them, the Doctor says most of them would have died. . . . Merriman will probably be unanimously elected Bishop of Graham's Town. I have issued my mandate for the election. The consecration will probably take place on S. Andrew's Day. I start, D.V. for Namaqua Land on September 4th, with Edward Glover. I do not much relish my six weeks' most uncomfortable journeying. It is a dreadful country."

Before starting the Bishop suffered from a severe attack of lumbago, and admitted that he was altogether out of order, though, with his usual cheerful patience, he says in a few hurried lines written just before starting, that he trusts to the Visitation to put that right! In the same note (concerning many matters, and written to Mr. Edward Gray) he speaks of two years as needed to complete certain matters, adding, "And I do not expect to live so long!"

Starting for this Visitation the Bishop wrote to Mrs. Williamson:

"I feel my darling's departure more and more. Just now I am making all the arrangements which she ever made for our long journeys. For twenty years, I think, I have scarce been away from home without her. My only guide over a great part of my present journey to Namaqua Land is a tracing of the country, with all information connected with it, in her dear hand. She was bent on making this journey with me. I sometimes allow myself to think of what the departed may be permitted to do and see. If she can do so, I am sure that she will not only be interested in what interested her here, but continually looking on and praying for me and my work."

On September 4th the Bishop started upon the journey alluded to. Archdeacon Glover kept a very interesting Journal of this Visitation tour in Namaqua Land—the Bishop for the first time failing to do so, probably in part from feeling ill, and still more from the many recollections which such Visitation Journals brought with them. From that first short Visitation, more than twenty years before, when he had taken his wife, affirming that she "would never want to go again," Mrs.

Gray had not failed to go with him, often bearing fatigue and privation that make one wonder her health did not break down much sooner, but resolute in her determination to go, knowing to how very great an extent she could help and spare her husband amid the toil which he so gladly endured, but not without cost. Even this very Visitation she had intended to share, and but a very short time before her illness was known to be fatal, the Bishop had written: "Sophy insists upon going with me to Namaqua Land, but I cannot allow it in her present state."

It was the same cart in which they had so often travelled, and three of the old team, with one new horse, Phœnix by name. The Moravian mission station Mamre was the first point; then Saldanha Bay, where the Bishop confirmed thirty-eight candidates in Dutch, and gave the Holy Communion to fifty-five persons. Hostzis Bay, S. Helena Bay, Hopefield, and Malmesbury came next. Great heat, and sickness among the horses, made the journey very uncomfortable, and caused delays, which, on September 14th, nearly led to a serious accident in crossing Oliphant's River. In the darkness the driver missed the drift, and "we found ourselves," Archdeacon Glover says, "with the horses' heads down the river. The Bishop and I both got out [into the water], he to make out the proper exit, and I to explore a turning place for the horses, free from holes." They got out with some difficulty. Again, after leaving Clanwilliam, there came a very troublesome time,—struggling through rivers, the Bishop, Archdeacon, and their men all in the water, dragging cart and horses through or up hills "at a rate of from six inches to six feet at a time," till the Bishop, who was not well to begin with, and suffering from the old trouble of sleepless nights sometimes spent in the cart, was so exhausted that he could hardly get on at all.

Great heat, and a nearly broken axle, detained the Bishop at Ebenezer, a Rhenish mission station; and on September 23rd they reached Bowesdorp, a village consisting of Dutch church and parsonage, four houses and five huts. The church is capable of holding about 500 people, and was well filled on the occasion of their "Nacht maal," which took place on the following day (Sunday 24th).

"It was a very picturesque sight. Seventy-one wagons had already arrived. The village lies in a hollow, with hills or low mountains all around, and in this basin the wagons and their inhabitants were encamped. Almost every one had a gipsy fire beside it, with cooking apparatus."

The Bishop and his companion had secured a not very luxurious room, but it was to them a luxury to go to bed at all, and to wash in the morning. But the Bishop was already very much exhausted; every day he seemed to suffer more, the Archdeacon said; but he did not relax in whatever work he had undertaken, though evidently performing it with increasing difficulty. September 27th they reached Ookiep, the head-quarters of the Cape Copper Mining Company, where they were warmly welcomed by Mr. Wild, the superintendent, and the other officials. "It is a dreary, desolate country; true, the want of things pleasant to the eyes above ground is in some measure compensated for by the possession of the richest copper mines in the world below; but this is only the share-holders' consolation."

The next day the Bishop went off to Port Nolloth, Mr. Morris, the Company's chaplain, going with him; while Archdeacon Glover remained at Ookiep to take services on Sunday and Michaelmas Day. At Port Nolloth the Bishop became seriously ill, and on rejoining him at the house of the Company's manager, Mr. Hall (who with his wife nursed him most tenderly), his son-in-law found him "deplorably thin and weak." However, he gathered up strength to confirm at Springbok on October 13th, and he undertook to preach both there and at Ookiep on Sunday 15th, but that day a messenger was sent to the latter place to tell the Archdeacon that the Bishop was too ill to come. Indeed he had so serious an attack that it was with difficulty he could be got back from the church.

"Over-fatigue," he wrote, October 27th, 1871, "brought on a very severe illness at Port Nolloth, when Edward Glover was 100 miles off. Nothing could exceed the kindness of every one. I was nursed most tenderly. The manager of the mines sent their doctor 100 miles, and he and Edward rode through the night to get at me."

The overland journey now became impossible. "The day before I was to return by land I was able to do nothing but lie on a bed, so I gave the journey up, and came down in a wretched little coaster. We had nothing but foul winds, and were out seven days and nights. I am still very weak and reduced, but gradually gain strength now that I am at home again. It is a month since my attack. I find a great many troubles on my return; two of my Clergy dying.[1] . . .

"The Dean has been making a stir in Cape Town; he finishes an Octave of Services to-morrow, on the re-opening of the Cathedral after its alterations. I mean to say a few words at the eleven o'clock Celebration on All Saints' Day."

The Consecration of Archdeacon Merriman was soon again to call the Metropolitan forth. He wrote to the Bishop of Winchester:

"Bishop's Bourne, Graham's Town, Dec. 5th, 1871.

"On S. Andrew's Day I consecrated, with the aid of the Bishops of Maritzburg and Bloemfontein, the Bishop of Graham's Town—my old friend Merriman, who was universally elected by the Clergy and Laity of the Diocese. He is much beloved by all, and his consecration excited very deep interest.

"I sent you by last mail my correspondence with the authorities of the Dutch Church on the subject of Union. They have since spent a day with me discussing points at issue, and, as they enjoyed it, I hope they will renew their visit. It is only slowly that new ideas will spread in this country; but we are strong in our position, and discussion will do good.

"I inclose the substance of a letter written to Gladstone and to Lord Kimberley, which will explain itself. If you can help to prevent this dangerous Bill[2] from becoming law I am sure you will do so. I would have written to the Archbishop,

[1] The Rev. Edward Langdon and Rev. Robert Sheard.

[2] This was a Bill which Dr. Colenso had got through the Natal Legislative Council by a majority of one, transferring property vested in the See of Cape Town to that of Natal. It was reserved, by order of Lord Kimberley, for the consideration of Government.

but Colenso has made such use of his name and sayings in time past with reference to him in a speech before Committee of the Council, and published in the Blue Book, that I am sick at heart, and shrink from doing so. Colenso's Church Council have passed a resolution that his successor must be a Bishop who refuses to have anything to do with the Provincial Synod; and it is commonly said that if he succeeds in getting this Bill passed, he has another ready, providing for the succession to his See. If this matter is not nipped in its present stage, there may be provided by Colonial law a scheme for a schismatical succession. The Diamond Fields are growing in importance; the Bishop of Bloemfontein has already there three Clergy, one Catechist, and two Readers, and he is going to send a Clergyman for the natives. There are said to be 50,000 people there."

To the Rev. CHARLES N. GRAY.

"Port Elizabeth, December 12th, 1871.

"My dearest Charlie—Blanche and I are here on our way back to Cape Town. The consecration went off very well. The Bishop is beloved by all Dissenters as well as Churchmen. I found him very low and weak, unable to walk about the town with me. He got better during the excitement and great fatigue of our week at Graham's Town. We had late dinners, and early rising, and too little sleep, and this was more than I liked. I am sending home for publication the Bishop's ride through Independent Kaffraria to Natal and back. It is very racy. He and Waters say that his spirits were overpowering during all that time, when he was living upon mealies, and sleeping with natives in a Kafir hut. . . . The Bishop of Bloemfontein is doing, I think, very well. . . . I am afraid that I shall be little more than two months at home before I am off on a three months' journey; half of the time must be in the Karroo, and I do not like the idea."

To EDWARD GRAY, Esq.

"Port Elizabeth, December 13th, 1871.

. . . "Gold is coming into this country in great quantities in payment for diamonds. These are revolutionising the

country. I suppose that I passed 300 wagons on my way to Graham's Town, either bringing down wool or taking up to the Fields the necessaries of life. They cannot find men or horses now for the traffic, and a railroad for 400 miles has become a necessity. Then the gold fields in the Transvaal are becoming productive. God seems beckoning us on into the heart of Africa. This town is fast growing rich, and all the country begins to look up. From some parts, however, half our Church people have gone to the Fields. . . . The yield is certainly more than a million, perhaps nearer two millions per annum. Half the people have diamonds in their pockets. I think that I am stronger for my trip to the east, but I sigh for the quiet of home, where work is accumulating. I shrink from another long journey from March to June. I am weary in body as much as in spirit. I fear from all accounts that William[1] must be breaking. Well, he has had a long tranquil quiet life, and if only he be ready the change will be blessed. I think that he has felt that one loss a blow, as I do mine. We may go on with our work, and be thankful for many undeserved mercies, but the world and life can never be again what they were. Do not think, my dear fellow, that I murmur; I am surrounded with blessings. . . . Pray let all remember that I want at least eight more ladies, and that this Diocese is most anxious to have Sisterhoods."

The Bishop alludes repeatedly in the last few letters to an attempt for union with the Dutch Church. From his earliest days, even the quiet studious days at Whitworth, when he had time to read Church history, his heart always yearned for unity, and his visit to Germany with this object in 1857 has been mentioned. The present attempt rose from two resolutions passed by the English Synod in the beginning of 1870 to the effect that

"I. This Synod desires, with special reference to the circumstances of the Church in this land, to express the deep sorrow with which it views the divided condition of the flock of Christ throughout the world, ardently longing for the fulfilment

[1] Mr. William Gray, the Bishop's eldest brother. He died July 1872.

of the prayer of our Lord, 'That they all may be one, as Thou, Father, art in Me and I in Thee; that they also may be one in Us, that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me;' and here solemnly to record its conviction that unity will be most effectually promoted by maintaining the Faith in its purity and integrity, as taught by the Holy Scriptures, held by the Primitive Church, summed up in the Creeds, and affirmed by the undisputed General Councils; and by drawing each of us closer to our common Lord, by giving ourselves to much prayer and intercession, with fasting and humiliation, by the cultivation of a spirit of charity and forbearance, judging ourselves rather than others, and a love of the Lord's appearing.

"II. That this Synod, deeply deploring the manifold evils, and especially the hindrances to the powers and spread of Christ's Kingdom in this land, resulting from the divisions among Christians, would rejoice if, before its next session, the state of feeling in the various religious communities should afford an opportunity to the Bishops of the Province of discussing with the authorities of other communions the principles upon which re-union in one visible body in Christ might be effected among those who are now unhappily divided."

These resolutions the Metropolitan sent to Dr. Faure, Moderator of the Dutch Church, and a correspondence followed,[1] which, however, as might be expected, did not lead to much. It was hardly possible to look for any real approach to union with a body who reject Episcopacy; and as to what is called "exchanging pulpits,"—Priests of the Church lowering their office by preaching in dissenting places of worship, or inviting dissenters to speak to their people,—the Bishop did not consider that any advance towards real unity could ever be made by such unworthy compromises. To all such propositions he was "constrained to reply that whatever it is that keeps us apart and forbids our becoming one Communion, unfits us, in my estimation, to be at once safe and outspoken teachers of each other's people. There are few things, as it appears to me, which would do more to undermine men's belief in any posi-

[1] See *Sermons and Charges*, etc.

tive Creed, and lead them to think that the Church holds nothing as fixed and definite, than the laxity which the system you advocate might introduce as to preachers and the doctrines preached."

The Bishop's published "Reply" concludes with some prayers for unity—*e.g.* that from the Prayer-book—"O God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," etc., the daily prayer of A. P. U. C.,[1] and the Collect for S. Simon and S. Jude's Day.

It will be remembered that in his Charge the Metropolitan alluded to the Evangelical Alliance, saying that he had always looked with interest upon its proceedings, "though based, as I think, upon an essentially wrong principle, because I have regarded its formation as the expression of a conviction that our present state is a wrong one, and ought not to be persevered in. Its work is a preparatory work. It may pave the way for future reunion and reorganisation in one body. It can never become a substitute for the unity of the Church. Organisation is essential to joint action. . . . Christians cannot do the work of Christ effectually while they are separated from each other. An 'alliance' is a junction for certain purposes and for a certain time of two or more distinct and separate parties. How far short is such a union of that which our Lord prayed for His disciples, 'that they all may be One, as thou, Father, art in Me and I in Thee; that they may be made perfect in One.'" The Bishop alludes to "the steps taken by the American Church and our own Convocation towards the restoration of communion with the orthodox Greek Church; and the societies (A. P. U. C., the Eastern Church Association, and the Christian Unity Society) founded and prayers published for the restoration of unity both in England and America; the publications put forth jointly by members of different Churches on this subject; and the reviving Gallican principles in the French Church, which are, in many respects, so near our own," etc. etc.

"Are not all these things tokens for good? Do they not indicate a very widespread and deep-seated conviction that a divided state is a wrong state—that true believers in Christ should not remain for ever in a state of alienation from each other, but should search after some basis for union among

[1] Association for Promotion of the Unity of Christendom.

themselves? May these convictions spread deeper and deeper as years pass on, among ourselves and throughout Christendom! May the Comforter descend with healing in His Wings, and unite all the followers of a common Master in one household and body and Church, holding and embracing the 'one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of us all.' Our prayers should be directed to this end; our daily intercessions should be offered for the restoration of lost unity among ourselves and throughout Christendom. We should strive, amid our manifold divisions, to give as little offence as may be to those who are separated from us. If the restoration of unity be the condition of the conversion of the world, every sacrifice but that of truth must be made to attain it." [1]

Some of those who were about the Metropolitan at the time when the Grand Duke Alexis of Russia visited the Cape remember how he sent several messages to the Duke's Chaplain inviting him to come to Bishop's Court and seeking friendly intercourse. The Chaplain, however, happened to be a monk, unable to speak anything but Russ, and not at all highly educated, or able to enter into religious discussion with the Bishop. It seems even doubtful whether the messages were ever delivered to him. A friend observed to the Metropolitan that it was a great pity the Grand Duke was not accompanied by some learned man—some Bishop who could have had free intercourse with him. His reply was that had such a man come to Cape Town, he would have offered him the use of the Cathedral, would have attended his service, and have gladly communicated at it, if permitted so to do.

The year 1872—which was to be the last of Bishop Gray's life—opened with very hot weather. He was cheered and comforted by the increasing number of communicants.

"They are largely increasing," he wrote January 1st. "There were 450 at three celebrations in the Cathedral on Christmas Day; Badnall at Rondebosch had 150. This morning at 6.30, at Claremont, I had sixty. All these are

[1] These words are part of an extract from Bishop Gray's sermon, published in the second series of *Sermons on the Reunion of Christendom*, 1865.

much in excess of other years. I think there is some growth in the religious life here." At this time he was very anxious for the establishment of Brotherhoods, with a view to forwarding this growth. "If we cannot work through some sort of a Brotherhood," he said, "the Romans bid fair to get a large share of education into their hands. I would that something were done in England to draw out and regulate the zeal of young men through Brotherhoods."

The Bishop writes:

"Bishop's Court, January 4th, 1872.

"My dear Butler—What is passing in England and here is impressing me with the necessity of our attempting, if possible, the work of education through Brotherhoods. You know the state of things around you. Here the Romanists are planting schools under Marist Brothers, in all the towns and centres of population, and bid fair in this way to get a great hold upon the country. They scarce do anything for Missions. The system hitherto in operation is for committees to establish schools, or individuals to set them up. High salaries are looked for. The committees get behind hand, the school becomes vacant, and there is delay in filling it up. There is no stability in the system, and consequently no confidence. On the other side there is a Corporation which can always keep the schools going. The teachers are trained; they work for the love of Christ, not for money. I am afraid that we have not the material here for founding a Brotherhood, nor the funds, and if such institutions existed in England, you would absorb for years to come all trained in them. But you have had much experience in training women, and once contemplated the establishment of a Sisterhood of teachers, therefore I write to ask you to consider whether anything can be done about a Brotherhood. Do you suppose that —— or —— are making this branch of work their own, or is there any Brotherhood that does? I lament greatly that so little progress has been made in establishing Brotherhoods."

There was much work to be done, and he had no longer the devoted help of his wife to take so much of detail off him.

"I came home last night from a short Visitation to Malmesbury," the Bishop writes, January 16th, "and am in the agony of making up my complicated accounts, public and private, with which I have had very little to do for many a year. . . . What a whirlpool all nations and Churches seem to be in! Everything seems so unsettled. Yet for our own Church I am more hopeful than the dear Bishop of London. She has yet an important work to do as regards all Christendom. She upholds, with all her shortcomings, Catholicity far more than Rome does. We can grapple with the difficulties of the age, which she only denounces or mourns over."

To Miss MACKENZIE.

"January 19th, 1872.

. . . "You will feel the loss of dear Bishop Patteson, whom in your last letter you compared to your dear brother. Perhaps the Church growing indifferent to its Missionary duties, and so unfair as it is becoming, if we may judge by the press, to its Missionary Bishops, needed this blow to revive its dying zeal and interest."

To the Rev. CHARLES N. GRAY.

"Bishop's Court, January 20th, 1872.

"My dearest Charlie—I have only a few minutes before breakfast to write. Worrying work is pressing upon me just now,—the Orphanage, Hospital, S. John's, with much more. I am writing to men in England about a Brotherhood. I see plainly that we must have one here, both for Mission work among the Malays, and the work of higher education, at least in the East. Perhaps the Superior might be also Chaplain or even Warden of the Home. I should be very glad to have any notes or information about Retreats. I never was present myself at more than one.[1] . . . I believe our people are very

[1] That Retreat was at Cuddesden—occupying from July 23-26, 1862—a time when, it will be remembered, the Metropolitan's cares were pressing almost at their heaviest upon him. One of the Priests (the Rev. T. Edwards of Prestbury) who shared in the Retreat, writes as follows: "On arriving at Cuddesden on the

much what their Priest is. If we do not see the Life of God growing in them the fault is mainly ours. I think the Epistles to the Seven Churches a good study for pastors; they make me tremble, and I hope humble. If we want to raise our people up, we *must* look to ourselves. It is an awful thought that our faults are reflected in them; that they imbibe our tempers, our worldliness, our selfishness. You speak of severe sermons. It is just this that is ruining ——'s work. If severe, we may be indulging our own *natural* mind. The servant of the Lord must be 'gentle unto all men, and in meekness instruct.' People must be won, not driven. The dearest mother's grave is at last finished and nice."

A few lines from the Bishop of Winchester, in reply to a letter quoted above, are at once characteristic of both the men:

"Osborne, February 18th, 1872.

"My very dear Friend and Brother—I was very glad to get your letter, and see your hand again. I read the account

afternoon of July 23rd, it became known that the intended conductor could not come (H. P. Liddon, I believe, who was detained by the death of a relation), and that the Bishop (Wilberforce), who arrived also the same afternoon, would conduct it himself. He did; and not one, I feel sure, who was present, but must have felt the wonderful power with which it was done. One address, especially, cannot have failed to live in the remembrance of all who heard it, founded on the history of the old Prophet in Bethel, and the man of God from Judah (1 Kings xiii. 11-32). It was most solemn and impressive. When the Retreat was over, and some of those present had already left, the Bishop of Cape Town, who had been present throughout the Retreat, sent to the College, inviting all who could to go into the Palace that they might unite with him in an expression of thanks to the Bishop of Oxford for conducting it. I went, as no doubt did all who were not gone, and the Bishop of Cape Town expressed, in the name of all, our gratitude to the Bishop of Oxford, who, when looking for a period of retirement and refreshment for himself, had suddenly and without preparation undertaken the laborious task of conducting the Retreat, of which we had enjoyed the fruits. All were under the influence of this Retreat; and the Blessing, which at the conclusion of his address, the Bishop of Cape Town asked for, and the Bishop of Oxford gave, as we all knelt in one of the large rooms of the Palace, concluded an incident, simple indeed, but deeply impressive, and all the more so, looking back at it now after an interval of twelve years, and remembering that both those holy men, to whom, as well as to us, that time had been among their holiest moments, are resting from their labours."

of Bishop Merriman's consecration with the liveliest interest. What a work you have been permitted by God to do in that land! I rejoiced in the Dutch Church overtures, and trust that it may please God to bring some real union out of that. It is entirely your having grounded the Church on its own proper basis that makes anything there possible. I have done all in my power as to this vile Bill, both with Kimberley and Gladstone, and I quite trust that we may overset it. The Bishop of London, and the Archbishop (who is wonderfully restored to health), are working with me as to this.

"I long, my beloved brother, to know how God is sustaining you in your loneliness. In some respects our joint loss, and its undying grief, is even a heavier trial when it falls on us young, as it fell on me, than at your age. There is not now the sad looking forward to a long life of lonesomeness. But I have no doubt that there are respects in which every year only adds to the grief. The dear one becomes part of the very life. I trust God, Who is Almighty, is upholding you, and that your health bears it. The illness of the Prince [of Wales] has wonderfully woke up the loyalty which, thank God, is deep in the nation's heart. He is nearly recovered; the Queen, I trust, very well, but her nerves a good deal shaken. I am labouring hard in my new and vast Diocese, and I think I begin to see a decided stirring in it, for which God be praised. I think that we shall escape, at least I trust so, mischievous legislation, now that what I have so long laboured and suffered for,—the restoring Convocation to practical work,—is actually accomplished. But more than ever do we need to pray that we may surrender no point of the Faith committed to us.—I am ever, my very dear brother, yours in hearty affection,

"S. WINTON."

It was, indeed, as the Bishop of Winchester said, "part of his life" that was gone from Bishop Gray. He went on working, and his letters speak cursorily of his different labours, with the often repeated—not lament—but, as it were, a long-drawn sigh, "All brings back my darling forcibly at every

turn." Bishop Cotterill says that almost the last words the Metropolitan spoke to him, when they parted in 1871, were that he could not, like many, find relief from sorrow in his work, because she had been so entirely identified in that work. Yet there was no flagging in it, no giving way. "If they propose to tamper with the Athanasian Creed," he writes, February 15th, 1872, "I must publicly protest." He tells his sister, "You will think me strong again when I tell you that yesterday, with the thermometer at 85°, I walked seven miles, celebrated, and preached twice, reaching home at nine, and that this morning I was up before five o'clock to walk to Claremont for 6.30 celebration. What we want most now is a Theological College."

He was preparing, early in March, to start on a Visitation tour of three months—not well, by his own admission, and having seen the doctor—evidently in suffering, but writing playfully, to take off what might be a sad impression to his sister, and joking about his girls: "Do you know their three names? Regan, Goneril, and Cordelia—I take the liberty of changing these as it suits me." On February 19th, writing to his son, when weary of the "twenty different sets of accounts," the Bishop says: "You have not been so long at Helmsley as I in Africa (to-morrow is the twenty-fourth anniversary of our landing), but your responsibility for the state of souls around you is growing every day. As you grow, I believe your people will grow. I would that I had borne this more in mind during nearly forty years of my ministry. . . . If the Church at home tampers in any way with the Athanasian Creed, it will be a bad day for it. I shall protest with all my might."

To the Bishop of Bombay.

"February 20th, 1872.

"My dear Bishop—The departure of the Squadron for Bombay offers an opportunity for writing to you on this the twenty-fourth anniversary of my landing at the Cape. How full of toil and of sorrow these years have been, you in some measure know. There cannot, in the course of nature, be many

more. All that I care about for myself now is, that I may daily be preparing for the change; that when it comes, I may, with my dearest, behold our Lord's Face in glory. Your last letter was to me somewhat sad. You seem to feel yourself bound hand and foot by the restrictions which tie you to India, when, if in England for a few months, you might probably supply all your wants. It is curious that you should ask me about Benson, at a time when I had been writing to him about a Brotherhood for this land. You will probably have heard from him that your Metropolitan had anticipated you, and that some of the Brotherhood were already destined for India. I have nearly come to the conclusion that I shall never do much for the Malays of Cape Town except through a Brotherhood, and that in the Eastern Province. The (Roman) Christian or Marist Brothers will drive our Church and all others out of the field as educators, unless we train Brothers. . . . The state of the Education question in England also satisfies me that we must have Brothers and Sisterhoods there for education. I am in communication with several leading men in England on this subject. At least half my Sisters wish my Home to become a Regular Sisterhood, *i.e.* that they should bind themselves by vows: Chastity, Poverty, Obedience. There are many practical hindrances and difficulties, and I do not see my way clear. The chief recommendation to me is the greater stability and permanence to the work at my death. . . . If other Bishops will not work with you, and Societies cannot provide you with men, might you not yourself take steps to found a Missionary Order for the conversion of India, to confine their labours to your Diocese, until invited to work in others? . . . If you do anything, you must work out your plan yourself, and invite men to join you. I cannot help thinking you would have a response."

Bishop Gray had written, June 1st, 1871, to Father Benson (then in America, establishing his Society of Evangelist Fathers there), to say that he believed "a Brotherhood most likely to be an effectual instrument for the work of conversion among the Malay population in South Africa," and inquiring

whether the Cowley Fathers "contemplate a work of this kind; whether you have any whom you could spare for such a mission, etc. etc. Will you let me know,—I. Whether pure mission work is contemplated by you, or by any other Brotherhood with which you are acquainted? II. Whether you could send out two men; and if so, whether in Holy Orders or not? III. In what relation such a branch of your Order would stand to the Bishop of the Diocese and to the Clergyman in whose parish they might live and labour? IV. What mission they would receive, and from whom? V. What the probable cost would be?" This letter elicited the following very interesting reply from Father Benson:—

"Charlotte Town, Prince Edward's Island,
"August 10, 1871.

"My dear Lord Bishop—Your letter has reached me here after nearly three months' travel. It was a very great pleasure to me to receive the kind invitation which you have given us. I hope it may some day be possible for our Society to avail itself of it. We are growing in numbers, but we are not yet strong enough to put out a fresh branch. . . . It is now barely five years since Father Grafton and I first came together by God's Providence. The numerical growth is therefore quite as rapid as we could desire. . . .

"You ask about our ecclesiastical position. I am still Incumbent of a parish in the Diocese of Oxford, which puts me so far under the Bishop. Bishop Wilberforce quite sanctioned the formation of our community, and approved its purposes. The present Bishop is very kind.

"I did not feel that it was well to put the Society very definitely under the Bishop's control, for of course he must be exposed to external pressures which might be fatal to us, however heartily the Bishop in his own person might sympathise with us.

"Our Community is, after all, only a *family*, and is not in need of any permanent mission or jurisdiction. Any one of us who may, like myself, be in charge of a parish, will of course

receive mission by being instituted to that cure. The rest of us are, as far as the Church at large knows of them, only *unattached Priests.* The fact of these being pledged to Poverty, Chastity, and Obedience, is a matter which merely concerns their own life before God. Even if the Church recognised our Community, and the position of the Superior in it, ever so formally, it would be unable to supply any guarantee, or to enforce any rule against the determination of any individual. Even in the old-established Orders on the Continent, the traditionary usages of the Community, and the authority of the Pope, fail to coerce the moral sense of the individual, now that legal force does not back them up; and we see, in the case of P. Hyacinthe, how they are obliged to give way when a real disciplinary difficulty arises. I felt, therefore, that we must trust to the Holy Spirit to enable us to live together in unity in fulfilment of our vows. May He Who has begun the good work in us accomplish it unto the day of Christ.

"As to any *work* which we undertake, we always go at the invitation of the parochial Clergy, and we therefore receive a mission for that work by virtue of that invitation, and of course the Bishop's sanction, often actually given, and at any rate implied, unless he were to forbid our doing what we are asked.

"We moved from a lodging-house into a permanent Collegiate Home in October 1868. It is situate in Cowley S. John, a new and populous district which has grown up within my parish. When I went to Cowley, twenty years ago, this district was nothing but open fields. Now it is formed into a separate incumbency. I have parted with the old parish church, and retain only the new district. Here the 'Mission House of S. John the Evangelist,' the Mother House of our Society, is situated, and the advowson of this district is vested in members of our Society, so that we may be sure of having the parochial authorities always at one with us. We have an annual celebration of our entrance into this House by a Retreat of Clergy in the first week of October—generally 50. Mr. Carter, Principal King, Mr. Randall of Clifton, have conducted them for us hitherto. In the following week I always have a layman's

Retreat, with especial view to undergraduates,—so that they spend Monday to Friday in retreat, and go into College on the Friday evening after October 10th as usual. Besides having our own regular time-table, we in the Society occasionally go into a religious Retreat for a month. We have so much external work, and our missions involve us in so much society, that we find such Retreats necessary in order to sustain the religious side of our own life. It is not much that we can boast of at the best, but I hope by degrees we shall grow, and, at any rate, that the next generation of the Society will grow into more formed habits of recollectedness, meditation, and Divine life.

"Last year we had various offers from America. . . . The Corporation of the Advent Church at Boston offered us the Rectorship of their Church. Bishop Whitehouse of Illinois offered us a site of land, and money, for an educational institution near Chicago. Accordingly, Father Prescott, an American, has been carrying on all the services of the Church of the Advent, with the assistance of various Priests who have helped us from time to time; and, I am thankful to say, God has greatly blessed the work of the Society there. The revival has been quite remarkable. It is quite the strongest germ of Church life in Boston, and we are hoping to have a fine church built there next year, so that, I suppose, our Society will remain on indefinitely in charge of that work. . . . I found it impossible for us at present to close with Bishop Whitehouse's offer. . . .

"Bishop Eastburn's refusal of a license to myself did not injure our work very much, if at all. I used to have Bible classes in the schoolroom, which were well attended. This he sanctioned, as having no right to forbid it.

"Besides this I went with Father O'Neill to the Bahamas, and he spent Lent there conducting missions in the Diocese of Nassau. The Bishop of New York was also very kind to us both publicly and privately. He took me to address the Candidate Class at the Theological Seminary.

"We also had some mission work and preaching in the Dioceses of Maryland, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Rhode Island.

"Since leaving the States I have been at Montreal and Quebec, and we have had three missions in New Brunswick, one going on now in this place, and some contemplated in Halifax and elsewhere in Nova Scotia.

"I have, therefore, every reason to be thankful for God's goodness in helping us on throughout this journey, although there have been some clouds. Probably even the hindrances have been a real strength to our future position. Your very kind letter makes me feel that it is due to you to let you know exactly what our present position is. I did not see how else to do so except by giving you a narrative of our origin and growth. We have been for some time past in communication with Bishop Milman. Father O'Neill has devoted himself to the work of India, if we can get any members of the Society fitted to go out with him there. Permanent mission work amongst the heathen is therefore not a new idea to us. I should not like to send out a Branch of less than *three* to start with. I should greatly delight to think that our Society was working under your auspices; and if the ground is not occupied when our numbers are equal to the undertaking, I hope we may be permitted to do so. But I fear that it must be some time ere we can look forward to it.

"It was with great sorrow that I heard of your very great loss. I did sympathise with you most sincerely, and do so still, for I know it must be a loss that you feel greatly in almost every circumstance of the day. It is my humble prayer that our Heavenly Father, Who gives us consolation proportioned to our sorrow, may enable you to experience increasingly the joy of His abiding strength, and the living power of the unbroken Communion of Saints.

"Intreating your blessing upon myself and the Society which is under me, I am, my dear Lord Bishop, yours very faithfully in Christ, R. M. BENSON."

It is interesting to find, that, as far back as June 1854, Bishop Gray was in communication with the future founder of the Society respecting mission work; and, in April 1865,

writing to acknowledge an expression of sympathy from the Brotherhood, the Metropolitan says: "If a man of any intellectual power is called to mission work, India seems to me his field, though I confess the lack of men for China and Japan seems to give those countries great claims. I long to see a strong staff in Pekin and Yeddo." The Bishop's desires have been fulfilled as regards India, and the Evangelist Fathers are doing good work there. We must hope and pray that Bishop Gray's earnest longings for his own Province, as well as for China and Japan, will be carried out, and that Religious Brotherhoods may ere long be established in those lands also.

The Visitation began March 14th, the Bishop leaving "most matters in the Diocese and Province in fair working order, by dint of hard work." He began with Paarl, Wellington, then Ceres, and then the Karroo. The Bishop wrote to his son:

"Beaufort West, April 5th, 1872.

. . . "We are getting on very well, and if it please God shall on this day week have emerged from the wearisome Karroo, through which, however, we have had a prosperous route. I begin to feel that I care less where I am or what I do, so that it be God's work; but I am often tried and depressed as I go from place to place, and remember at each what we did and said when we were last there together. It is wonderful how fresh and vivid these remembrances are: the events seem but as of yesterday; but then I think that I can look forward to being with her again ere long. In a few days a whole year will have passed. . . . Work in this village is going on fairly well. The Rectory with its nice garden is new since I was last here; the church needs enlargement. There are twenty-four candidates for confirmation, among them two Kafirs, who having been baptized here, had gone to the Diamond Fields, where they were making money. They were sadly afraid they would miss my Visitation, and as soon as they heard that I was coming, they came down in the transport wagon, full 350 miles, at a cost of at least £6 each, and when I leave they go back at the same cost. We often meet with encouraging in-

stances like this of zeal and earnestness. This place is miserably divided. . . . After preaching on 'Forgive us as we forgive,' one went up to —— and was reconciled before Holy Communion. —— afterwards grasped me by the hand, saying, 'You have done one good work, I have forgiven ——.' . . . The point about which I am most anxious is the Athanasian Creed. *Any* tampering with that is to my mind an indication of a latent unsoundness, or at least indifference to the Faith. The disparaging of it in any way would give a great lift to the spirit of unbelief. There can be no objection to a new translation in principle, if the old be faulty; or to notes of explanation, but the old translation has not, that I am aware of, been complained of till of late, and I doubt whether comments upon it, with a view to meet objections, would be satisfactory. Were the Athanasian Creed set aside, the very same spirit would next assail the Nicene Creed."

To Mrs. Williamson.

"Knysna, April 22nd, 1872.

. . . "I am now travelling through the country which the dearest wife so enjoyed riding over, and which is so beautiful, abounding in forest and green grass, and sea views and lake scenery. Everything is full of her. She was never happier than when mounting her horse at the door of this little Parsonage, which stands on a hill looking down on a pretty village, and a lake five miles broad, and gates of rock which form the entrance to the harbour. She is happier now, I trust, in the presence and love of her Lord. This was her special week of suffering. Saturday will be the dark dark day of my life when I lost her. I shall then, D.V., be confirming candidates from our Mission congregation in their little wooden chapel at Plettenburg Bay. We have got on hitherto very well in our journey. The horse-sickness which has denuded the country of horses, has not yet attacked our horses, for which I am most thankful. They have travelled nearly a thousand miles in the last six weeks, and we have perhaps 600 more to go. I have spent most part of to-day in riding out to call on Harry

Barrington's wife; her husband has gone down to Parliament. Dearest wife always rode out there on our Visitations, and I did not wish to omit the visit. It takes up, however, the greatest part of the day, and is fatiguing. To-morrow we start for Plettenburg Bay, and shall not get back here for six days; then we proceed to George."

From the same place the Bishop wrote to his son: "I think the scenery from the Long Kloof to this place looked more beautiful than ever. The dearest mother greatly enjoyed her rides in this part of the country. I remember what happened at each place of difficulty before the magnificent government road was opened. I am now writing in the little room where we have so often been together, and where her figure is constantly before me. I cannot forget that these were the days of her greatest suffering, and that next Saturday will be the sad day when she was taken from me. It is my great comfort to think that she is in Paradise. I am learning the difficulty of ever living by faith in the unseen. . . . I am anxious to do something by way of protest as to tampering with the glorious Athanasian Creed, but I have so little time that I fear that I cannot draw up a satisfactory document. If I get a quiet day this week at Newdegate's I must prepare one, to be signed by the Bishops and perhaps the Clergy. I find our work generally going on well. I had 65 communicants here yesterday, out of a congregation of 120."

The attack upon the Athanasian Creed which so sorely tried the faithful in England at that time, stirred up the Metropolitan of South Africa to the very bottom of his soul. He wrote to the Bishop of Winchester:

"Oakhurst, George, May 1st, 1872.

"My dear Bishop—I write during my only rest of two days during my three months' journey, partly because you ask how I am getting on in my pilgrimage, and partly because I wish to tell you how astounded and shocked I am at this sudden outburst against the glorious creed of S. Athanasius, which the proceedings in both Convocations reveal. The speakers have

taken exactly the line to be expected of each. Say what men will, this movement indicates the little hold which definite dogmatic Truth has upon men's minds in our day, and makes me tremble lest our candlestick should be removed. I do not believe it will, for I am year by year more and more convinced that God is training the Church of England to do Him a work in the world. But nothing that has occurred during these years of struggle has shown me so clearly how many there are who pass for sound and orthodox men, who would never *witness* for Christ amid troublous times. I have read great part of the debates while here, and I have written a Protest in the shape of a letter, which I trust all the Bishops of this Province will sign. The Church of England can, of course, throw over creeds if she will, and relegate them to a great theological lumber-room; but if she wants to continue the Mother of Churches, and to retain the love and allegiance of those she has founded, she must not do so. The Creeds are our common property and inheritance, and they must not be set aside except by the Churches of our Communion in common council, if the union of Churches is to be maintained. I firmly believe that if this movement, fostered by both Archbishops, succeeds, it will go far to break up our Churches. . . . As to myself, I am quite well. . . . May I only be preparing, during the days which are left, for reunion before the Throne. As you say, lives are interwoven, we were identified in everything; she had as much interest in all my work as myself. . . . May God preserve and keep you, my dear Brother, ever to be a witness for Him and for His Truth. —Ever affectionately yours, R. CAPETOWN."

A letter written a little later to one perplexed (August 2nd, 1872) goes very clearly and fully into the Bishop's mind on this subject:

"I cannot see," he says, "what safeguards we can have for the Faith, if such a view of creeds were assented to. My position is this.—Our Lord promised that the Holy Ghost should abide with His Church for ever, and guide it into all the truth. Whatever, therefore, the whole Church has agreed

upon as to matters of Faith, is simply what God has revealed in His Word. The Athanasian Creed has been received by the whole Church as the unerring exposition of the mystery of the Blessed Trinity. The monitory clauses have been received by the whole Church equally with the rest of the creed. In these the Church affirms, as part of the Faith, that Faith is essential to Salvation, and she tells us what the true Faith is.

"No particular Church can lawfully touch a particle of the creed. It is the office and right only of an Œcumenical Council to do so. I do believe that the Holy Ghost did and does guide the Church even in the most minute and particular expressions. It is just here that the guidance is needed. Heretics propound plausible and seemingly orthodox creeds and definitions: the religious instinct of the Church discerns the latent or expressed heresy, and gives the true definition. This is the way in which the creeds have grown. They have been the Church's heaven-guided voice exposing heresy and teaching truth without error. Really the question as you put it, is whether there is a definite Faith or not? If a man does not believe the Church's exposition of it, he does not believe the Faith. A Socinian would say, as Arius said, that he believed 'the great fundamental truths of Christianity, put forth simply and broadly in God's Word, for our reception.' I am sure, if you will think it out, that you will see that the latitude which you advocate would open the door to any amount of heresy upon fundamentals. We have no right to say that any part of the creed is a 'preamble!' It is the creed as it stands in our Prayer Book that the Church has received. It makes no distinction between clauses expounding the truth as to the Blessed Trinity and any other clauses. She delivers to us the whole creed to maintain and hand on unmutilated. . . . The Athanasian Creed has been received by the universal Church, and has in consequence in its entirety the same authority as the Apostles' Creed. Surely we cannot split it up, and say we receive this portion but not that? I deny the right of any branch of the Church to tamper with the creed. . . . The language of the monitory clauses simply announces God's decrees, if the creed is a true exposition of the Faith.

With the application of those decrees to individuals we have nothing to do; as the whole Church is indefectible in matters of Faith, the creed must expound it truly. If so, 'he that believeth not is condemned already.' Who believes or who does not must be left to the judgment of the Great Day. I never supposed that the Church would allow the creed to be tampered with, when it spoke out, but at a great crisis each must speak out. Therefore I wrote."

To the Rev. CHARLES N. GRAY.

"Gouritz River, May 10th, 1872.

"We are here for a night by the banks of a river which sometimes rises seventy feet, *en route* from Mossel Bay to Riversdale. I had a satisfactory visit to George, where I confirmed about 60; had 120 at Holy Communion; and ordained two Priests and one Deacon. For six days we had scarce a moment to ourselves. Among the pleasures were one tea-drinking, with speeches and music for the whole white congregation, and another for the communicants of the coloured congregation. . . . On crossing the point at the Brak River from George to Mossel Bay, Jimmie shied and broke the pole of our carriage, which we have got webbed together with iron, and which will, I trust, take us home. At Mossel Bay I confirmed forty-five yesterday, Ascension Day. There were five services during the day and a half we were there, and we preached four times. They asked for six sermons. . . . I shall be out three Sundays more, but I feel that I have broken the neck of the Visitation, and parishes on the coast are more settled, and the country more civilised."

To Mrs. MOWBRAY.

"Swellendam, May 17th, 1872.

"My dearest Lizzie—I have not written to you for a long time, but you know how my time is taken up. From the moment I arrive in a village till I leave again my time is taken up with services, schools, visitors, etc., and when on the road there is nothing to be done. We are now within 200 miles of home,

but we shall take ten days to do it in. We are very weary and tired. In a few minutes I must be off to confirm sixty-seven, of whom only nine are English,—the rest converts from heathenism. You would have been amused if you could have seen our approach on Tuesday to a new Mission Station which I have founded on the coast. About two hours off we were met by half-a-dozen men on horseback;—these made themselves an advanced and a rear guard. As we drew nigh to the station a body of men marched out to meet us; they drew up under command of an American, who dressed his line, and ordered them to make their evolutions. Then came the women in not equal order. And then 'God save the Queen,' whereat we all uncovered. They sang and sang, and at last we discovered that it was a Dutch hymn to the tune of God save the Queen! Then we all went in procession singing hymns. . . . Here I am asked to take up a large station of the London Society, which is in great disorder. Altogether the work is prospering, though here and there it flags."

To the Rev. CHARLES N. GRAY.

"Caledon, May 23rd, 1872.

. . . "At Bredasdorp I confirmed thirty, and had full forty at an early celebration. . . . A few years ago we were doing nothing there, and now we have full 300 people, and 100 children in our schools. At Napier we are to buy a building for a little school chapel."

The Bishop reached home on May 29th. A fresh annoyance had come upon him through certain persons in Natal inimical to the Church having written to the Archbishop of Canterbury to ask him if Bishop Merriman's consecration without a Queen's license was not incorrect; and his Grace replied not very definitely, but intimating that it was wrong to have proceeded without it; upon which encouragement the enemies of the Church began to talk of legal proceedings. The Metropolitan wrote to the Bishop of Winchester that he had "sent the Archbishop an extract from a Natal newspaper containing an extract from his letter, with an indignant remonstrance from myself.

I told him plainly that he had no more right to interfere with the internal affairs of this Province than in those of York; and that we did not look to an Archbishop of Canterbury to sow dissensions among us. It has made one parish in the Graham's Town Diocese repudiate Merriman's jurisdiction, and will probably involve him in legal proceedings." [1]

The Bishop of Winchester had taken a lively interest in the idea of a Bishop of George being consecrated; and the Metropolitan wrote concerning this:

"Bishop's Court, June 17th, 1872.

. . . "I cannot act at once—I. Because the consent of the Bishops of the Province must be given *in Synod* to the foundation of a new See, and they cannot at present meet.

"II. The Provincial Synod requires that an adequate endowment shall be first provided. I may add that I could not consecrate a Bishop with the present income of the Archdeacon. I should have to guarantee more, and I have gone in this direction beyond what I ought to have done. Personally, I am considerably in debt for the support of works which I have guaranteed. I must also see Macrorie's income safe before I venture farther."

The burden of the Bishop's letters continued to be work—"Plenty of work on our hands!" There was much sickness, and pressure of all kinds. Letters were fewer than usual. July 4th the Bishop wrote to his son:

"I rejoice greatly over the debate and decision *in re* Athanasian Creed in the Lower House. It is one of those steps by which God is training the Church of England for the great work He has for her to do. He tries and scourges her, and she becomes more and more faithful, while full of tenderness and sympathy for the weak in faith. . . . At a meeting of the Clergy here yesterday we discussed elementary education; Marriage Defence Association; Athanasian Creed. An associa-

[1] In one of his letters the Bishop says playfully, "The Archbishop has shown a disposition to make himself a Pope, which you see, having the credit of being a Pope myself, I don't relish!"

tion formed; also a Committee to draft an address to Convocation. All unanimous but —— I shall probably see my Community develope into a strict Sisterhood, and I am gradually getting to the conviction that I must attempt a Brotherhood for education." . . .

"Bishop's Court, July 15th, 1872.

"I am always rushing from one thing to another, doing nothing well. . . . The longer I live the more I feel that *we* are answerable for shortcomings, or deadness, or rebellion, or departure from the true Faith in our people. Watch, therefore, if you would give your account with joy, and pray that I may be more watchful. Our people are interested in, depend upon it, our spiritual state and progress. What a call to self-discipline! God help us both to grow in grace. . . . As to S——, I should, I think, *when I was sure of myself*, and of the spirit in which I approached him, deal with his case as I should with one coming to confession. I would, if I could, make him see himself as he is.

"As to dining out, our Lord's example is enough as to the principle. . . . It is in this principle that I went to Government House last week to dine with the Grand Duke Alexis, and went yesterday to Simon's Town to a grand dinner on board the Russian frigate. I am sure that if the motive is not a worldly one, and we do not go into the world for pleasure or vanity, it is right to be in society occasionally. We may and ought to do some good there, and we may learn something ourselves. . . . As to doing no good, I have always found through life that when I thought I was doing most, and was elated, I was doing least; when I thought I was doing least, and was cast down, I have at times found that I had done some good."

On July 20th the Bishop confirmed on board the British Squadron, then in Simon's Bay, and the following day he preached on board the flag-ship.

In August came tidings of the death of the Bishop's eldest brother, Mr. William Gray.

"I have not been very well myself of late," he wrote,

August 16th, "having been threatened with a return of my Port Nolloth attack. I am still very weak, but I have been into town on Bokkie to-day. . . . This day last week a wild little horse, which shies terribly, gave me a throw. I sustained only bruises, and rode on to town, and did a day's work there: he swung full round with me four times that day! You need not lecture me; it is very seldom that I mount him; he is a first-rate travelling horse, and a great favourite. On Tuesday I got through a Confirmation with 180 candidates, and full 1,000 or 1,200 in church, with some difficulty. I hope to be well enough to preach in the Cathedral on Sunday on marriage with a deceased wife's sister."

By the same mail the Bishop wrote a few lines to his sister, the last of that loving full correspondence which he had never failed in from boyhood. There is not much in the note.

"My dearest Annie—I must send a line to you, though I have told Edward all I have to say. Perhaps the girls will not tell you that they are giving themselves greatly to music. There is a Mr. Burke here, a Clergyman's son, who has taken the whole Cape by storm. He is a great teacher, and has pupils everywhere, and large classes of sixty or seventy in the College Hall, which the girls attend weekly, and another in Cape Town. A few days ago both classes were joined, and they sang a cantata to which they invited their friends. It consisted mainly of choruses, which were much admired. They are now at work on 'Hear my prayer.'[1] Our family circle

[1] There is a happy association with this anthem. Archdeacon Glover wrote to Mrs. Williamson:

"September 5th, 1872.

"It must have been, I think, the last dinner that we had together, we two alone (for the others held night-school three nights in each week), that something suggested that anthem 'Hear my prayer,' in which the wondrously beautiful treble solo and duet occur 'Oh that I had wings like a dove!' etc. The remembrance of the anthem, which the Bishop said he had always loved, recalled to him the past, and seemed to bring the future also before him. For some minutes after he kept repeating the words, dwelling on them lovingly—not that he was one of those whose work for his Lord was ever *distracted* by 'gazing up into Heaven.' If ever any one loved his Lord with an ardent passionate love (though he did not

is dwindling away. In a few short years, or less, we three shall have passed, and our place on earth know us no more. May I be, any way, as nearly ready for my call, dearest sister, as you. May it be a happy day for us all. I trust it will. . . . I am just now in a low and depressed state, entirely, I think, from internal causes. I think for the last six weeks it has rained nearly half the time. I suffer much when I do not get a full amount of exercise. The other night we had, in twenty-four hours, three inches of rain! I get very depressed in illness, chiefly, I suppose, because a sluggish liver seems to be the cause."

The "call" was indeed then very near. On one of the last days of July the Bishop was present at a little festival given by the Sisters to their Refuge girls, distributing prizes, etc., and showing the Sisters, with much amusement, a paper he had just received about the George Diocese, headed with the words "A living dog is better than a dead lion." On the day that he was thrown from his horse, the Bishop went to Cape Town, where he transacted a good deal of business, and received the English mail, which, among other tidings, contained that of his eldest brother's death; and afterwards he went to the Home, where, in the course of conversation, he repeated, what he not unfrequently said, that whenever he thought to be doing a great deal he had really done little, and *vice versa*. Some one asked "Which are you doing now?" "Oh, nothing at all!" he answered, but the next moment added, "I will tell you what I have been doing to-day,—trying to break my neck!"

The next day, August 10th, the Bishop walked to Wynberg, and on Tuesday 13th he held a confirmation in S. George's, which the day before he had feared he should not be able to do, feeling so thoroughly weak and ill as he did. The exertion was very great, however, as all present observed. Three times

talk much of it), it was he; but his love was shown by his work. Even when the other happier world was brought so close to him by his dear wife's death, he did not sit down in sorrow, yearning for his own time, but set to work with zeal quickened, if possible, by the feeling that his Saviour was even nearer and dearer to him than before, and had 'taken him aside to speak to him.'"

his head drooped, and he could hardly raise his hands, and had to drink some water. In his addresses to the persons confirmed (which were very short), he pressed the necessity for coming immediately to Holy Communion with even more than his usual earnestness. At the end of the service, the TE DEUM was chanted, the Bishop standing before the altar, with all his Clergy round—the last public office of the Church in which he ever assisted—and surely a most fitting one.

He rode in to Cape Town on Friday, August 16th, and went to the Home, where he took some food—(the Sisters were having their early dinner)—and talked in his usual kindly, cheerful way about many of their interests. Two little boys, who had been handed over to them that morning by the magistrates, were brought to him by the Superior, as the first candidates for the Little Boys' Home, which he was anxious to establish under the Sisters' care. The Bishop talked to the children, and then going to the Oratory, heard some confessions before returning to Bishop's Court, when he seemed very tired.

The course of the following days must be told in the words of his son-in-law, the Ven. Archdeacon Glover, written to one of the Bishop's most valued friends, the Rev. the Hon. Henry Douglas.

"Bishop's Court, Claremont, 2nd September 1872.

"I have heavy tidings to give you—the loss of our dear Bishop and father, and, I well know, your own very dear and loving friend. We ought not to grudge him his rest, nor the happy reunion with wife and daughter, nor, what he looked forward to still more, his being with his Saviour, yet we struggled hard to keep him. All through the most dangerous part of his illness there was daily celebration at S. George's Cathedral, and very earnest prayers were offered with *the* offering; and in the Home, the Sisters and members of their guild kept up a continuous stream of prayer for several days and nights, and from, I suppose, every Church in the Diocese, prayers rose for his restoration—but it was not to be. Christ knew what was for his happiness better than we, and took him to Himself. It is blasphemy to think that the same wise and loving Lord

did not also know what was best for the Church of this land; and so, though we cannot see it, we must believe that it is so, and I hope *do* so believe. . . .

"On August 9th, as he was riding to town, his horse shied and threw him rather heavily. He mounted again, rode to town, did business for some hours, received the letters by English mail—one containing the news of his brother's death (William)—and rode home looking a little shaken and feeling a little bruised, but as he and we thought no otherwise the worse. The next day—10th August—I walked to Wynberg, etc., with him. His bruises, he said, made him *feel* walking. Before my walk with him was over, I was called off to Cape Town to stay with and help poor Lightfoot, whose eldest boy had been drowned. I returned on Monday, and found the Bishop unwell; the doctor had been sent for, but thought little of the sickness. There was to be a confirmation at S. George's the following day. Agnes had written to say it must be postponed, but he felt better and took it. The Bishop looked miserably ill throughout, and told me he was glad he had consented to the new arrangement (new for this Diocese) of sitting to confirm. The service took two hours; he called for water two or three times. After the quiet drive in the carriage, he said he felt better. The next day he had invited to an early dinner some friends who had showed much hospitality in the Karroo; he took much trouble in entertaining them, as genial as usual. On Friday the 16th he *rode* to town, and returned tired, but not alarmingly so. The next day he asked Blanche and me to ride with him; but he rode slow, an unusual thing with him, and seemed not to enjoy it. The next day, Sunday, he was to have preached at S. George's on the proposed legalising in the Colony of the marriage with the deceased wife's sister—a thing he felt very strongly on; but he came to my study and told me he felt too ill to preach, and I must go in for him and make arrangements. On the 19th-22nd he was still unwell, but not so much so as to alarm the doctor or us. On the 23rd, having spoken to him first, I arranged with the doctor for a consultation of doctors, who came the next day.

Meanwhile, that same evening, the Bishop suddenly became much worse, falling as he was walking, and being taken with great pain, so much so that I sent off at once for the doctor, and by his advice sat up with him all night. From that time he never left his room, and Agnes, Blanche, or I, were always with him night and day. The doctors on the 24th said that the case was a serious one, but they saw no grounds for despair. They all agreed that he was suffering from diabetes, but thought that the case was complicated by fever supervening. They all thought that the fall *might* have been the cause of the former complaint being brought into more active operation. On the 25th-28th inclusive, he mended so much that we became quite happy. His pulse went down from over 100 to 80, and his strength increased. He even bade me get the last *Guardians*, and read him a letter from Mitchinson about the Mauritius Bishopric, as well as anything else of Church interest, especially with regard to the Alt-Catholic movement. On the 29th he got worse again, suffering very intense pain in his left side. Blanche sat up with him till 2.30 of Friday morning, when I relieved her; then he called me to him, and told me he thought his end was near, and he wished to say some things to me. I wish I could remember his very words—he told me of his hopes and fears with regard to the future of the Diocese, his greatest fear being lest his successor should not sympathise with the work of the Sisters as he had done, and as they deserved. 'They are but women,' he said, 'and have their weaknesses and may make mistakes; but 'oh, the treasure *is* in earthen vessels,' and they *are* doing Christ's work.' He spoke of the unaltered faith in which he had lived and which he had preached. He spoke of how he had yearned for the union of the Church, and, as he spoke of this, his poor weak voice swelled into power, and his whole face glowed. He spoke of his own spiritual state humbly but *carefully*, telling me that he did, however, feel a very intense love to his Lord, and he did think that he had striven to serve Him and do His work 'without any self-seeking,' and he hoped and thought with little thought of self. He told me that, looking carefully back at his

chief public acts, he was thankful to see nothing to repent of: he meant, he said, specially the Colenso case. He added that he told me this, because some said that on their deathbed men see things of that sort in a newer or kinder light. On Friday the 28th the three doctors came again and considered that he was worse than when they first saw him. On Saturday morning when his doctor paid him his first visit, he was shocked at the change since yesterday, and counselled not to wait till the morrow for Holy Communion. When I went and asked him 'What time *to-day* would you like Holy Communion?' he said, 'I thought we said to-morrow.' 'The doctor thinks to-day better,' I said. He knew what I meant, and said 'Well, dear fellow, I am ready when you like.' He received it at twelve, joining with very clear voice in all responses,—Amens, Gloria in excelsis, etc. He was less exhausted than I thought he would be. The three doctors came again that day, and still professed that it was not hopeless. It was Blanche's turn to sit up that night. I sat up with her; we were both much troubled by the painful and troubled nature of his sleep. At three we each retired to our rooms, leaving the professional nurse in charge. At five she called me to say that there had been a great change. All the trouble and pain seemed gone, and he was apparently sleeping easily, but the nurse's experienced eye was right. We all assembled, I read the commendatory prayer, and two minutes after his soul was with his Saviour.

"I need not say that intense anxiety has been shown by all classes of people during the illness, and an immensity of sympathy and sorrow at his death."

Some few particulars may be gathered from a letter, telling the sad tidings, to her brother, written by one of the Bishop's daughters:

"After his fall he did not complain of anything but a few bruises, but the next day, after walking over to Wynberg to tell William[1] of his father's death, he complained of feeling tired

[1] Captain William Gray, eldest son of the brother just dead.

and weary. However, the next day he insisted in walking over to church at Wynberg in the pouring rain, and the doctors think it probable that the fall or the wet walk brought on or hastened the attack. . . . On Friday evening, the 23rd, he became much worse, and as he was walking off to bed, holding on to me, he fell down on the floor. We got him carried to bed, and he never got up again. . . . He was very quiet and peaceful, and we hardly knew when the last breath was drawn. . . . He told Florence about a week before that he was dying. Occasionally he asked us to read the Lesson for the day, or some hymns, but he was soon tired. In the early part of his illness he went on with a volume of Milman's *Latin Christianity* which he was reading.[1] He did not send messages to any one; he just said a few words after receiving Holy Communion on Saturday, but he was always so weak that speaking much was an exertion. He was always most loving and affectionate to us, and afraid of our tiring ourselves by sitting up."

Thus closed the earthly scene; and one of God's choicest and most devoted servants passed from this world's weary strife (to him, above most, how weary!) to rest, in his own words of humble hope, at the Feet of his Dear Lord for ever. It was at 6 o'clock on the morning of Sunday (14th after Trinity) September 1st, 1872, that the greatest Bishop perhaps of recent times was called to join the Church Triumphant.

Directly that the alarming nature of the Bishop's illness was known, daily prayers and celebration on his behalf were begun. And in the Home, where he was beloved indeed as a father, a continual intercession was kept up night and day. One of the Sisters wrote home:

"September 4th, S. Cyprian's, Cape Town.

"We were privileged to see him on Monday afternoon as he lay in the little chapel at Bishop's Court. At first I was distressed, for I should not have recognised him in the least, so great was the change. But as I looked, I thought to myself,

[1] The last book the Bishop read to himself was the *Spiritual Letters of S. Francis de Sales.*

Why, this is a *young* man of about thirty! . . . This wonderful change[1] in his countenance was so remarkable that Mr. Fisk noticed it in his sermon last night. All were amazed at it. You know our Bishop had a beautiful countenance always, but what that beauty was on Monday you cannot conceive. Do not imagine that I am speaking of what might have been the effect of my own excitement. I am but feebly expressing what the sober minds of those of his Clergy who saw him, also saw with no less astonishment than we felt."

On Tuesday, September 3rd, the Bishop's body was laid to await the Resurrection beside that of his wife in Claremont Churchyard. All that could be shown of public honour was rendered,—flags half-mast high, tolling bells, and universal black,—but there was something far beyond that in the real heartfelt mourning of all classes, all religious professions, all nationalities. After their own fashion, every one felt that the Father of all was gone from them. The burial was attended by thousands, yet the deepest stillness and hush prevailed. The procession included every possible class, from the Governor-General and his staff; Commodore, and every official;—all the religious bodies in the place—the Vicar-Apostolic and his Clergy—and many a poor Malay and Negro, many a poor native who had found a friend in him now being carried to his grave.

"I wish you could have witnessed his funeral" (Archdeacon Glover wrote to the Bishop of Winchester, September 5th, 1872). "All hearts seemed bowed to one master-feeling, the sense of our irreparable loss, softened and brightened with the thought that the garlands that lay on the head of his coffin meant a great reality;—that he had won his rest. I heard one say as the multitude moved from his grave, 'If ever man won his rest, that man has.' For myself I shall never see his like again,—at once a tower of strength, and loving and gentle as the gentlest woman;—one who never knew what envy was, or that ever gave a thought,—so I verily believe,—to his own

[1] The Bishop's daughters were startled in like manner by the strong likeness they now saw for the first time between their father and brother.

glory and advancement. . . . As we stood in the bright spring afternoon round his grave in the beautiful Claremont Churchyard, tokens of his work met the eye in all directions;—the large band of Clergy,—the Sisters, the thousands of silent mourners of all ranks and denominations;—a wondrous sight to me who remember the first small beginnings of things."

"If you could see the magnificent country through which we were passing" (one of the Sisters of S. George's Home writes): "the mountains and every speck of ground are now literally white like snow with flowers, sparkling in a bright sun. Then this mass of living beings of every colour, age, sex, and rank, in profound silence, with heads uncovered. And at last the little church, his own building, and the most beautiful one in the Colony;—the Chancel, which is much raised, and very deep, crowded with Clergy, in their surplices. Of course the churchyard itself could not contain so vast a multitude. The Sisters remained till every one was gone, and then covered the grave with flowers, so that not a speck of the sandy soil was left uncovered. The Cross which they made to lay on the coffin was composed of white camellias, roses, orange-blossom, lilies of the valley, and a few little bunches of sweet violets."

The Burial Service was said by the Rev. Canon Ogilvie, and the Lesson read by the Rev. A. Wilshere, and the hymn sung—

"Brief life is here our portion,
Brief sorrow, short-lived care;
The Life that knows no ending,
The tearless Life, is There!"

And before leaving the grave the assembled multitude joined reverently in the hymn (one of the last things his eldest daughter had read to the Bishop, and his favourite hymn)—

"Art thou weary, art thou languid,
Art thou sore distrest?
Come to me, saith One, and coming
Be at rest."

His grave, like that of his wife, is marked by a block of

granite, bearing a full-length white marble Cross, with the inscription—

ROBERT GRAY, D.D.

FIRST BISHOP OF CAPE TOWN AND METROPOLITAN,

Fell asleep, September 1st, 1872.

"*My Beloved is Mine.*"

Surely Bishop Gray's life and death need no commentary. His own words have sufficiently told that life, and nothing can strengthen the impression they must make on all true Christian hearts that love the Church of our Dear Lord. We may close the page with the few brief words written to his son, on hearing that he had gone hence, by the dearest friend he had on earth —so soon himself to follow, Bishop Wilberforce:

"I must tell you how entirely I have been sympathising with you under this great blow to our Church, to our Missionary work, and to all of us who dearly loved him. And yet what a grand and fitting ending has it been. How like his all-enduring, royal, hero-course!—and now to know that he is at Rest, and where he ever longed to be, with his Saviour and his God!"

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX I.—Vol. I. p. 512.

JUDGMENT of the LORDS of the JUDICIAL COMMITTEE of the PRIVY COUNCIL on the Appeal of the Rev. WILLIAM LONG *v.* the Right Rev. ROBERT GRAY, D.D., Bishop of Cape Town, from the Supreme Court of the Cape of Good Hope; delivered June 24, 1863.

Present—Lord Kingsdown; the Dean of the Arches; Sir Edward Ryan; Sir John T. Coleridge.

THIS is an Appeal from a decision of the Supreme Court of the Cape of Good Hope in a suit between the Appellant, the Rev. Mr. Long, claiming to be the Incumbent of the parish of Mowbray, in that Colony, and the Respondent, the Lord Bishop of Cape Town. Mr. Long, being in possession of the church of the parish of Mowbray, and in receipt of the income attached to the benefice, refused to obey certain orders which the Bishop, in what he considered the due exercise of his episcopal authority, thought fit to issue, and for such disobedience the Bishop issued against Mr. Long sentences, first of suspension, and afterwards of deprivation. The validity of these sentences, and especially of the last, was the question to be decided by the Court below, which, by a majority of two Judges to one, has held them to be valid.

In the argument at our Bar many questions of great novelty and importance were raised and discussed with remarkable ability. Some of them were considered, and very justly, by the Counsel as seriously affecting the well-being of members of the Church of England in the Colonies and other dependencies of the Crown. We propose to deal with these questions only so far as may be necessary for the purposes of the present decision, and to abstain as far as possible from saying anything which may prejudice cases that may hereafter arise.

It is advisable, in order to make the reasons of our Judgment intelligible, to state in some detail the facts as they appear upon the record.

The Bishopric of Cape Town was founded in the year 1847. At this time the legislative authority in the Colony of the Cape of Good Hope was vested in the Crown. There was no State Church; all denominations of Christians stood on an equal footing; there were no Ecclesiastical Courts as distinct from Civil Courts. The Supreme Court, under the Charter of

Justice, granted in 1832, had supreme jurisdiction in all causes—civil, criminal, and mixed—arising within the Colony, with jurisdiction over all subjects of the Crown, and other persons within the Colony.

In this state of things Letters-Patent were issued by the Crown, dated the 25th September, 1847, erecting the Colony or Settlement of the Cape of Good Hope and its dependencies, and the Island of S. Helena, into a Bishop's See and Diocese, appointing the Respondent, Dr. Gray, to be ordained and consecrated Bishop of the See, and commanding his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury to ordain and consecrate him accordingly. The Letters-Patent purported to empower the Bishop to perform all the functions appropriate to the office of a Bishop within the Diocese of Cape Town, and especially to give institution to benefices ; to grant licenses to officiate to all rectors, curates, ministers, and chaplains, in all churches, chapels, and places where divine service should be celebrated according to the rites and liturgy of the Church of England ; to visit all rectors, curates, ministers, and chaplains, and priests and deacons in holy orders, of the United Church of England and Ireland, and to cite them before him, or before the officers whom he was authorised to appoint, and to inquire concerning their morals, as well as their behaviour in their several stations and offices. Power was given to the Bishop to appoint Archdeacons, a Vicar-General, Official Principal, Chancellor, Commissaries, and other officers ; and it was provided that an appeal should be made from sentences of the subordinate officers so to be appointed, to the Bishop, and from sentences of the Bishop to the Archbishop of Canterbury. No Ecclesiastical Court was expressly constituted by these Letters-Patent, nor was power given to the Bishop to establish one ; and it was declared that they should not extend to repeal, vary, or alter the provisions of any Charter whereby ecclesiastical jurisdiction had been given to any Court of jurisdiction within the limits of the said diocese.

The Letters-Patent provided that the Bishop of Cape Town should be subject to the Metropolitan See of Canterbury, in the same manner as a Bishop of any See within the province of Canterbury, and should take an oath of due obedience to him as Metropolitan ; and they contained a clause that the Bishop might, by an instrument in writing under his hand and seal, addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury, resign his office ; and after acceptance of such resignation by the Archbishop, the Bishop was to cease to be Bishop of Cape Town to all intents and purposes. Dr. Gray having been duly consecrated by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and taken the oath prescribed, went out to the Cape to assume the duties of his office, and continued to discharge them till the latter end of the year 1853.

At that time it was considered by the Queen's Government that the then Diocese of Cape Town was too extensive for one Bishop, and that it would be advisable to divide it and make it into three Dioceses, to be called Cape Town, Graham's Town, and Natal. With a view to this arrangement Dr. Gray, on the 23d November, 1853, resigned his Bishopric into the hands of the Archbishop of Canterbury, by whom the resignation was accepted, and Dr. Gray ceased to be Bishop of Cape Town.

On the 8th December, 1853, new Letters-Patent were issued, by which certain specified parts of the original Diocese of Cape Town were erected into a distinct and separate Bishop's see and diocese, to be called thenceforth the Bishopric of Cape Town, and to this newly-constituted Bishopric Dr. Gray was appointed, and he was also appointed Metropolitan Bishop in the Colony of the Cape of Good Hope and its dependencies, and the Island of S. Helena. The new Letters-Patent seem to have been in other respects in the same form with the old.

But previously to the issuing of these Letters, the Crown had granted a Constitution to the Colony of the Cape. Representative institutions had been founded, and a Colonial Legislature established.

Mr. Long was officiating in the Colony as a Minister of the Church of England before any Bishop was appointed there. He had been admitted into Deacon's orders for the Colonies by the Bishop of London in 1844. In the year 1845 he went to Cape Town, and was appointed by the then Governor of the Colony to be Minister of the English Episcopal Church of Graaff-Reinet, his salary being paid partly by the Governor, partly by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and partly by his congregation. There seems to have been no endowment of any kind attached to this church. He had at this time no other authority for discharging the duties of a Minister in that Church than the Holy Orders which he had received from the Bishop of London and the appointment of the Governor of the Colony.

Soon after the arrival of the Bishop of Cape Town in the Colony in 1848, and while the first Letters-Patent were in force, Mr. Long was ordained priest by the Bishop according to the form and manner of ordaining priests as contained in the Book of Common Prayer; and, on being so ordained he took the usual oaths prescribed by the laws and usages in force in England, and amongst others the oath of canonical obedience to the Bishop, by which he engaged to pay to him true and canonical obedience in all things lawful and honest.

On this occasion the Bishop granted, and Mr. Long accepted, a license from the Bishop to officiate and have the cure of souls over the parish and district of Graaff-Reinet, the Bishop reserving to himself and his successors full power to revoke the license whensoever he or they should see just cause so to do.

In the year 1854 a clergyman of the English Church, named Hoets, built and proposed to endow an Episcopal Church in the parish of Mowbray, in the Colony of Cape Town, and to convey the church to the Bishop, upon certain terms agreed upon between them; and by a Notarial Act in the Dutch form, dated the 2d June, 1854, Mr. Hoets transferred in full and free property to the Bishop and his successors in perpetuity, for ecclesiastical purposes, a piece of land therein described, "with the church which the Appearer had lately erected thereon at his own cost and charge for the worship of Almighty God according to the Liturgy and Ritual of the Church of England, situate in the parish of Mowbray."

By a Notarial instrument of the same date, to which the Bishop and

Mr. Hoets were both parties, the conditions on which the grant was made are stated.

The first is that the church shall with all convenient speed be consecrated, and shall be at all times used and enjoyed by the parishioners of the parish of Mowbray free from any charge.

Mr. Hoets covenants with the Bishop to pay a certain salary to the clergyman or incumbent to be appointed and instituted to the spiritual charge of the said church and parish in manner aftermentioned during the incumbency of the two first incumbents thereof, as and for a provision or endowment towards the stipend of such two first incumbents, and a mortgage is made by Hoets to the Bishop of certain bonds in order to secure the due payment of the stipend.

The Bishop, in consideration of the premises, covenants with Hoets, that he, the Bishop, and his successors will admit, institute, and appoint unto the said endowment, and unto the spiritual charge and care of the said church and parish, a Clerk to be presented and nominated by Hoets (such person being a priest in holy orders of the United Church of England and Ireland, or of any of the Colonial Churches in communion with the said United Church, and not subject to any spiritual or ecclesiastical censure or other impediment) as the first incumbent of the said church and parish. And so in like manner upon the death, resignation, or removal for any lawful cause of the first incumbent, upon the like presentment of Hoets, to admit, institute, and appoint a second incumbent.

There can be no doubt that by these deeds a trust was created between Mr. Hoets and the Bishop, and that the Bishop became trustee of the church and of the funds provided for its support, and held them in that character.

On the 3rd of June, 1854, Mr. Long and several of the parishioners of Mowbray presented a petition to the Respondent, as Bishop and Ordinary of the diocese, praying him to consecrate the church, and on the 6th of June his Lordship consecrated it accordingly, and signed an instrument under his episcopal seal declaring such consecration, and reserving to himself and his successors, Bishops of Cape Town, all ordinary and episcopal jurisdiction, rights, and privileges. On the same day his Lordship preached in the parish church, and referred to the Appellant as being henceforth the parish priest.

There were, or were supposed to be, some impediments to the institution and induction of the new incumbent in the English form, and no such ceremonies took place, but Mr. Long entered into possession of the benefice, and discharged his parochial duties, receiving from the Bishop a license to officiate and have the cure of souls within the parish and district of Mowbray. In this, as in his former license, the Bishop reserved power to revoke it if he should see just cause, and Mr. Long on these occasions renewed his oath of canonical obedience to the Bishop.

We will here observe, in order that we may not have occasion again to refer to the point, that we consider the good faith of the arrangements between Mr. Hoets and the Bishop to have required that the nominee of Mr. Hoets, when admitted by the Bishop to this church, should hold and

retain it on the same terms as a clergyman in England regularly instituted and inducted, and that the Bishop, by means of this license, obtained no right to suspend or deprive Mr. Long by the mere exercise of his discretion, or otherwise than for such cause as would have justified a sentence of suspension or deprivation in the case of a Clerk in full and lawful possession of his benefice. Indeed, it is due to the Bishop to say that we did not understand his Lordship to contend for more than this by his Counsel at our Bar.

In the year 1856 the Bishop was of opinion that, for the purpose of settling some scheme of Church government which should be binding upon the religious community of which he was the head, it would be desirable to convene a Synod, consisting partly of clergy and partly of laymen, members of the Church within his Diocese. The measure had been in contemplation, and, indeed, under discussion, for several years before, and different opinions had been entertained both by clergymen and laymen as to its legality and its expediency.

On the 15th November, 1856, the Bishop issued a pastoral letter, in which, after stating the reasons which induced him to believe that such a measure was expedient, if not indeed necessary, for the well-being of the Church in the Colony, and explaining the objects which might, in his opinion, be effected by means of a Synod, his Lordship proceeded to declare of what persons the Synod should be composed. These were to be, first, lay delegates, to be elected in the different parishes by adults, being, or at the time of the election declaring themselves to be, members of the Church of England, and of no other religious denomination. Secondly, duly licensed clergy, being in Priests' orders. Deacons were to be authorised to attend and speak, but not to vote.

Some of the subjects to be brought under the consideration of the Synod were then enumerated, including matters not exclusively of ecclesiastical cognisance ; as, for instance, the tenure and management of Church property ; questions relating to the formation and constitution of parishes ; difficulties which had presented themselves with regard to marriages, divorces, and sponsors ; and, finally, the desirableness, or otherwise, of seeking to obtain the assistance of the Legislature to carry out the objects of the Synod.

Mr. Long was summoned by the Bishop to attend the Synod, which was appointed to be held at the Cathedral Church in Cape Town on the 21st January, 1857, and he was requested to affix a notice of the intended meeting on his church door, and to take the necessary steps for holding the election of a delegate for his parish.

Mr. Long and his parishioners were opposed to this measure. The parishioners held a meeting on the 22d December, 1856, at which they resolved that no delegate should be elected, and Mr. Long neither attended the Synod himself, nor took any steps to forward the election of a delegate.

No attempt appears to have been made at this time by the Bishop to enforce obedience to his summons, but the Synod was held, and was attended, as it appears, by many of the clergy and laity, and various re-

solutions were passed by them, which were termed "Acts and Constitutions of the First Synod, held at Cape Town, January 21, 1857."

These regulations provided that a Synod of the clergy should be convened by the Bishop once in three years. They provided for the mode of electing delegates from the different parishes, and required that on some Sunday, or other convenient day, during Divine Service, each Minister should give notice of the day and place of meeting for such election in his parish or district, and should cause notice of the same to be fastened to the door of the church or chapel of the parish or district.

The clergy and laity were ordinarily to sit and deliberate together, the Bishop presiding, and to vote as one body; but any member of the Synod might demand a vote by orders, in which case no Resolution should be regarded as adopted by the Synod unless carried by a majority of both orders and assented to by the Bishop.

Various rules were made with respect to the formation of parishes, and the institution and induction of clergy; and all Presbyters and Deacons before institution or induction, or before receiving a license from the Bishop and as a condition of receiving such institution, induction, or license, were to sign a declaration that they would subscribe to all the Rules and Constitutions enacted by the Synod of the Diocese of Cape Town.

A Consistorial Court was appointed for the trial of all offences against the ecclesiastical laws of the Diocese, and various provisions were introduced with respect to the mode in which the trial should be conducted.

The Synod had been convened without any express sanction of the Crown, and no attempt was made to obtain the assistance of the Legislature to carry into effect its objects. It was stated at the Bar that the Synod resolved that it would not be desirable to make any attempt for the purpose, but we do not find any Resolution to this effect amongst the printed papers.

In 1860 the Bishop convened a second Synod, to be held on the 17th of January, 1861; and on the 1st of October, 1860, his Lordship addressed a letter to Mr. Long, inclosing a copy of a pastoral letter which he had issued, and also a copy of the printed Regulations adopted by the Synod for the election of Deputies. The pastoral letter referred to the Acts and Constitutions of the last Synod, and mentioned as one of the subjects to which his Lordship would have to call attention, the Constitution of the Ecclesiastical Court.

Mr. Long was of opinion that the convening of this Synod without the authority either of the Crown or the local Legislature was an unlawful act on the part of the Bishop; that the Synod itself was illegal, and its acts of no validity; and he declined therefore to take any steps himself for calling a meeting for the election of Delegates in his parish, but he handed over the papers to the churchwardens and sidesmen, that they might act as they should think proper, informing them at the same time of his own views upon the subject.

After some angry correspondence, in which, as usually happens, there are passages in the letters on both sides which the writers perhaps now

regret, the result was that Mr. Long refused to give the notice required of the intended election.

On the 27th November, 1860, he was served with a citation signed by the Registrar of the diocese, by which he was cited to appear before the Bishop on Monday, the 4th February, 1861, to answer for having neglected and refused to obey the commands and directions of his Bishop to give notice of a meeting to be held "in terms of a certain letter addressed and forwarded to you, and dated the 1st October, 1860, with the pastoral issued on the same day and therein inclosed."

Certain clergymen, five in number, were named by the Bishop to be his Assessors, but his Lordship offered, if Mr. Long had any personal objection to any of them, to change their names for those of other clergymen who might be resident in the neighbourhood.

On the 4th February, 1861, Mr. Long attended before the Bishop and his Assessors, and delivered in a letter signed by himself, stating, in respectful terms, the grounds on which he objected to give the required notice, and adding that if obedience were still required to the Bishop's command in that respect, it was impossible for him to pay it.

Mr. Long's Counsel at the same time handed in a protest signed by them, that no Judgment or sentence pronounced by the Bishop as the Judgment or sentence of any alleged Court was in any degree binding on Mr. Long, because no lawful authority was vested in the Bishop to hold, by himself or others, any Court or Courts competent to hear or determine any causes of what kind soever.

The Court adjourned, as it seems, without hearing evidence; there was no question of fact in issue. The Assessors afterwards delivered their opinions in writing to the Bishop, and on the 8th February, 1861, the Bishop pronounced a sentence suspending Mr. Long from the cure of souls, and the exercise of all ministerial functions and offices for a period of three months, and thenceforward until he should have expressed regret for his past disobedience, and his willingness to render obedience for the future.

His Lordship added, from motives which do credit to his feelings, the following note to his Judgment:—

"I have only to add that as you have a wife and children, I should be sorry to deprive you of any portion of your ecclesiastical income. You will be allowed to receive this, therefore, as heretofore for the present."

This sentence was intimated to the churchwardens of the parish, and they were requested to provide a clergyman to perform duty in the church during Mr. Long's suspension. Mr. Long, however, considered the sentence to be a nullity, and he continued to officiate as usual, apparently with the concurrence of the churchwardens.

On the 19th February, 1861, he was served with a citation by order of the Bishop to appear before his Lordship on Wednesday the 6th March, to answer for having failed to render due and canonical obedience to the Bishop, and for acting in defiance of the laws of the church and the authority of the Bishop. The citation recited the Bishop's order and Mr. Long's

disregard of it, and required him to appear and answer for his contempt, and to hear and receive such Judgment as the Bishop might see right to pronounce, and as the exigency of the case might require or authorise.

Mr. Long declined to attend this summons, and on the 6th March a sentence was pronounced by the Bishop, which, after reciting the various offences against his authority of which he considered Mr. Long to have been guilty, concluded in these terms :—

"I, therefore, Robert, by Divine permission, Bishop of Cape Town, do for these repeated acts of disobedience and contempt, withdraw the license of the Rev. William Long, and do deprive him of his charge, and cure of souls in the parish or parochial district of Mowbray, and of all emoluments belonging to the same. And I do, moreover, hereby admonish the said William Long not to officiate again in the said church or parish, and warn him that if he should do so after this his deprivation he will render himself still further liable to the censures of the Church. R. CAPETOWN.

"Cathedral Vestry, March 6, 1861."

Notice was given of the sentence on the same day to Mr. Long and to the churchwardens of Mowbray, who were required to conform to it ; and a gentleman of the name of Hughes was appointed by the Bishop to officiate in the church till a new Minister was appointed, and to receive one-half of the income.

On the 7th March Mr. Long and the churchwardens applied to the Supreme Court of the Colony of the Cape of Good Hope for an interdict to restrain the Bishop and Mr. Hughes from interfering with him in the performance of his lawful duties as Incumbent of the parish of Mowbray, and from disturbing him in the enjoyment of his lawful emoluments as such Incumbent.

Some further proceedings took place in this matter, but the Plaintiffs were required to file a declaration in regular form for the purpose of trying the important questions in difference.

The present suit was accordingly instituted.

It was a proceeding, of course, in the forms of the Roman-Dutch Law : a claim in convention by the original Plaintiff, and a defence and claim in reconvention by the Defendant, so that, in fact, both parties were Plaintiffs and both Defendants.

The claim of Mr. Long, after stating those several matters of fact on which he relied, insisted that he was aggrieved by the proceedings of the Bishop, and prayed the protection of the Court, and also a declaration of the law by the Court in conformity with his views on the several points in dispute ; and lastly, that he was entitled of right, and without any license other than his before-mentioned Letters of Order, and the presentation he had already received from Mr. Hoets, and the approval of such presentation publicly made known by the Defendant in June, 1854, to exercise all the lawful functions of Minister and Incumbent of S. Peter's Church, Mowbray.

The Bishop filed an answer and plea in reconvention, by which, as Defendant, he pleaded the Letters-Patent of 1847 and 1853, the license granted by him, and accepted by Mr. Long, as officiating Minister both of Graaff-Reinet and Mowbray ; he alleged that until authorised so to do by the Synod and until the formation of rectories by the same authority as after mentioned, and until certain rules on that behalf had been framed, he could not give, nor had he in any previous instance given, institution to cure of souls, or induction to benefices, in any other way than by licenses similar to that granted to the Plaintiff. He insisted that he cited the Plaintiff in accordance with the rules of the Synod, and in exercise of the authority belonging to him as Bishop, conveyed to him by the Letters-Patent ; that the sentences were Judgments or sentences ecclesiastical or spiritual so issued under the power and authority conveyed to him by the Letters-Patent, or otherwise of right belonging to him as Bishop of the Church of which the Plaintiff was a Priest ; and that the Plaintiff was, in consequence thereof, removed for lawful cause from the Church of Mowbray ; and he maintained, in conclusion, that the Court was not entitled to examine the sentence, but that if it were examined it ought to be affirmed.

This was his defence. In reconvention he prayed, by his second plea, that it might be adjudged that the Letters-Patent of the 25th September 1847, and of the 8th December, 1853, are valid in law, and that they confer the rights and powers claimed thereunder, and that ecclesiastical jurisdiction may thereby be lawfully exercised by him.

By his last plea he prayed that the said Plaintiff in convention and Defendant in reconvention might be restrained by interdict, so long as the sentence of deprivation should continue and remain in force, from occupying or attempting to occupy the Church of S. Peter's, Mowbray, or otherwise interfering with the duties of the minister of the said church.

On the 15th February, 1862, the Court gave judgment against the Plaintiff in convention and for the Plaintiff in reconvention, except as to his second plea in reconvention, to which we have already referred, and adjudged each party to pay his own costs.

This was in effect a decision in all material points in favour of the Bishop, and Mr. Long has been admitted to appeal to Her Majesty. The case seems to have been very well argued in the Court below, and though there was some difference of opinion amongst the three Judges who decided it, no one who reads their opinions can fail to admire the great learning and ability which they have brought to bear upon the questions submitted to them, and the judicial temper and moderation which they have shown in a case calculated to produce great excitement in the Colony.

The first question which we have to consider is, What authority did the Bishop possess under and by virtue of his Letters-Patent at the time when these sentences were pronounced ? The Judges below have been unanimous in their opinion : 1st, that all jurisdiction given to the Bishop by the Letters-Patent of 1847 ceased by the surrender of the Bishopric in

1853, and the issue of the new Letters-Patent; and 2ndly, that the Letters-Patent of 1853 being issued after a Constitutional Government had been established in the Cape of Good Hope, were ineffectual to create any jurisdiction, ecclesiastical or civil, within the Colony, even if it were the intention of the Letters-Patent to create such jurisdiction, which they think doubtful. In these conclusions we agree.

Dr. Gray had been duly appointed and consecrated a Bishop of the Anglican Church in 1847, and such he remained after the resignation of his See; but by such resignation he surrendered all territorial jurisdiction and power of proceeding judicially *in invitos*, so far as such authority depended upon the Letters-Patent of 1847. These points have not only been decided by the Court below, but have been embodied in their Judgment, by which they have expressly rejected the second claim above stated of the Lord Bishop.

But a majority of Judges below has held that the defect of coercive jurisdiction under the Letters-Patent has been supplied by the voluntary submission of Mr. Long, and that he is on that principle bound by the decision of the Bishop. This point we have next to consider.

The Church of England, in places where there is no Church established by law, is in the same situation with any other religious body, in no better but in no worse position, and the members may adopt, as the members of any other communion may adopt, rules for enforcing discipline within their body which will be binding on those who expressly or by implication have assented to them.

It may be further laid down that where any religious or other lawful association has not only agreed on the terms of its union, but has also constituted a tribunal to determine whether the rules of the association have been violated by any of its members or not, and what shall be the consequence of such violation, then the decision of such tribunal will be binding when it has acted within the scope of its authority, has observed such forms as the rules require, if any forms be prescribed, and, if not, has proceeded in a manner consonant with the principles of justice.

In such cases the tribunals so constituted are not in any sense Courts; they derive no authority from the Crown, they have no power of their own to enforce their sentences, they must apply for that purpose to the Courts established by law, and such Courts will give effect to their decision, as they give effect to the decisions of arbitrators, whose jurisdiction rests entirely upon the agreement of the parties.

These are the principles upon which the Courts in this country have always acted in the disputes which have arisen between members of the same religious body not being members of the Church of England. They were laid down most distinctly, and acted upon, by Vice-Chancellor Shadwell and Lord Lyndhurst in the case of Dr. Warren, so much relied on at the Bar, and the report of which in Mr. Grindwood's book seems to bear every mark of accuracy.

To these principles, which are founded in good sense and justice, and established by the highest authority, we desire strictly to adhere, and we

proceed to consider how far the facts of this case bring Mr. Long within their operation.

To what extent, then, did Mr. Long, by the acts to which we have referred, subject himself to the authority of the Bishop in temporal matters? With the Bishop's authority in spiritual affairs, or Mr. Long's obligations *in foro conscientiæ*, we have not to deal.

We think that the acts of Mr. Long must be construed with reference to the position in which he stood as a clergyman of the Church of England, towards a lawfully appointed Bishop of that Church, and to the authority known to belong to that office in England; and we are of opinion that by taking the oath of canonical obedience to his Lordship, and accepting from him a license to officiate, and have the cure of souls within the parish of Mowbray, subject to revocation for just cause, and by accepting the appointment to the living of Mowbray under a deed which expressly contemplated as one means of avoidance the removal of the incumbent for any lawful cause,—Mr. Long did voluntarily submit himself to the authority of the Bishop to such an extent as to enable the Bishop to deprive him of his benefice for any lawful cause, that is, for such cause as (having regard to any differences which may arise from the circumstances of the Colony) would authorise the deprivation of a clergyman by his Bishop in England. We adopt the language of Mr. Justice Watermeyer, p. 81, that "for the purpose of the contract between the Plaintiff and Defendant, we are to take them as having contracted that the laws of the Church of England shall, though only as far as applicable here, govern both."

Is, then, Mr. Long shown to have been guilty of any offences which, by the laws of the Church of England, would have warranted his suspension and subsequent deprivation? This depends mainly on the point whether Mr. Long was justified in refusing to take the steps which the Bishop required him to take, in order to procure the election of a delegate for the parish of Mowbray to the Synod convened for the 17th January, 1861.

In what manner and by what acts did he contract this obligation? The Letters-Patent may be laid out of the case, for if the Bishop's whole contention in respect of them be conceded, they conferred on him no power of convening a meeting of clergy and laity to be elected in a certain manner prescribed by him for the purpose of making laws binding upon Churchmen.

A very elaborate argument was entered into at our Bar in order to show that Diocesan Synods may be lawfully held in England without the license of the Crown, and that the Statute with respect to Provincial Synods does not extend to the Colonies.

It is not necessary to enter into the learning on this subject. It is admitted that Diocesan Synods, whether lawful or not, unless with the license of the Crown, have not been in use in England for above two centuries; and Mr. Long, in recognising the authority of the Bishop, cannot be held to have acknowledged a right on his part to convene one, and to require his clergy to attend it. But it is a mistake to treat the Assembly convened by the Bishop as a Synod at all. It was a meeting of certain persons, both

clergy and laity, either selected by the Bishop, or to be elected by such persons and in such manner as he had prescribed, and it was a meeting convened, not for the purpose of taking counsel and advising together what might be best for the general good of the society, but for the purpose of agreeing upon certain rules, and establishing in fact certain laws, by which all members of the Church of England in the Colony, whether they assented to them or not, should be bound.

Accordingly, the Synod, which actually did meet, passed various acts and constitutions, purporting, without the consent either of the Crown or of the Colonial Legislature, to bind persons not in any manner subject to its control, and to establish Courts of Justice for some temporal as well as spiritual matters, and in fact the Synod assumed powers which only the Legislature could possess. There can be no doubt that such acts were illegal.

Now Mr. Long was required to give effect, as far as he could, to the constitution of this body, and to take steps ordered by that body for convening one of a similar nature. He was furnished with a copy of the Acts and Constitution of the last Synod, and he was requested to attend carefully to the inclosed printed regulations with regard to the election of Delegates.

He clearly, therefore, was required to do more than give notice of a meeting, and he could not give the notice at all without himself fixing the time and place at which the meeting was to be held. He was required to do various acts of a formal character for the purpose of calling into existence a body which he had always refused to recognise, and which he was not bound by any law or duty to acknowledge.

The oath of canonical obedience does not mean that the clergyman will obey all the commands of the Bishop against which there is no law, but that he will obey all such commands as the Bishop by law is authorised to impose ; and even if the meaning of the rubric referred to by the Bishop in his case were such as he contends for,—which we think that it is not,—it would not apply to the present case, in which more was required from Mr. Long than merely to publish a notice.

We are therefore of opinion that the order of suspension issued by the Bishop was one which was not justified by the conduct of Mr. Long, and that the subsequent sentence of deprivation founded upon his disobedience to the order of suspension must fall with it.

It was strongly pressed, both before us and in the Court below, that supposing these sentences to be erroneous, Mr. Long had no remedy against them except by Appeal to the Archbishop of Canterbury under the provisions of the Letters-Patent. What authority his Grace might possess under the Letters-Patent, or otherwise, to entertain such an Appeal if it had been presented, it is unnecessary, and we think it is inexpedient, to discuss. It is sufficient to say no such Appeal has been presented, and that the suit in which this Appeal is brought respects a temporal right, in which the Appellant alleges that he has been injured. It calls for a decision as to the right of property, and involves the question whether Mr.

Long has ceased by law to be what in England is termed *cestui que* trust of funds of which the Bishop is trustee. Whatever else Mr. Long may by his conduct have done, we cannot hold that he has precluded himself from exercising the power which under similar circumstances he would have possessed in England, of resorting to a Civil Court for the restitution of Civil rights, and of thereby giving to such Courts jurisdiction to determine questions of an ecclesiastical character essential to their decision. Indeed, in this case the Appellant and Respondent have alike found it necessary to call upon the Civil Court to determine the right of possession of the Church of Mowbray.

We think that even if Mr. Long might have appealed to the Archbishop, he was not bound to do so ; that he was at liberty to resort to the Supreme Court ; and that the Judges of that Court were justified in examining, and, indeed, under the obligation of examining, the whole matter submitted to them. We, of course, are in the same situation ; and after the most anxious consideration we have come to the conclusion that the sentence complained of cannot be supported, and therefore we must humbly advise Her Majesty to reverse it, and to declare that Mr. Long has not been lawfully removed from the Church of Mowbray, but remains Minister of such church, and entitled to the emoluments belonging to it.

Being of this opinion, we are relieved from the necessity of considering, as a ground of our decision, whether the course adopted by the Right Reverend Respondent in the proceedings against Mr. Long was in all respects proper, and whether the proceedings themselves, if the Bishop be regarded as acting and entitled to act with the authority of a Visitor sitting *in foro domestico*, were conducted with that attention to the rules of substantial justice and that strict impartiality which are necessary to be observed by all tribunals, however little fettered by forms. Much argument was addressed to us at the Bar in this part of the case, and it would not be proper to pass it altogether without notice ; and first with respect to the suspension, and the constitution of the tribunal for the trial of Mr. Long on the first charge against him.

It cannot be held that all the provisions which would have been applicable to such a case under the Church Discipline Act in England were necessary to be observed in the Colony. This was impossible, but care should have been taken to secure, as far as possible, the impartiality and knowledge of a judicial tribunal. Here the Bishop was not merely in form but substantially the prosecutor, and a prosecutor whose feelings, from motives of public duty as well as from the heat necessarily generated in the purest minds by a long and eager controversy, were deeply interested in the question. It was, perhaps, necessary that he should preside as the Judge before whom the cause was heard, and by whom the sentence was pronounced ; but he should have procured, as a Bishop in England under such circumstances would have done, the advice and assistance, as Assessors, of men of legal knowledge and habits, unconnected with the matter in dispute, and have left it to them to frame the decision which he would afterwards pronounce. But instead of adopting this course, he

selected as assistants three gentlemen, all clergymen sharing his own opinions on the subject of controversy, and all themselves members of that Synod which Mr. Long was accused of treating as illegal.

Mr. Long was cited for refusing to give the required notice, but the sentence was not grounded entirely on this charge. The protest which he had given in by his Counsel against the proceedings was treated as a very grave offence. The Bishop, in speaking of it, says—

"To put in such a document is virtually to reject Episcopacy and the Church, and to stop on the very confines of schism, if not to have overstepped the line."

Mr. Long's conduct at a private meeting with the Bishop is discussed, as to which there is great doubt what really took place, and no regular evidence appears to have been produced, or was in fact admissible, for it was not to the point in question; and from the language of the Bishop in delivering his Judgment it may be inferred that the sentence against Mr. Long was not founded entirely on the only charge which he had been summoned to meet.

The proceedings which led to the subsequent deprivation are open to no less objection than those which resulted in the suspension.

The Bishop had declared before the first Synod that there were no rules or proceedings for trying ecclesiastical offences, and one of the objects of the Synod was to supply the deficiency. The Synod had established a Consistorial Court and certain regulations by which the trials of clergymen and of laymen before such Court should be guided.

These regulations had amongst other things provided that no sentence of deprivation should be pronounced by any person whatever, but only by the Bishop with the assistance of the Chancellor of the diocese, or, in case there be no such officer, some legal adviser whom he may see fit to appoint. The Bishop insisted that Mr. Long was bound by the rules established by the Synod, and must therefore, it should seem, have considered himself bound by them; and yet without any regard to these rules, without calling in the assistance of any legal adviser whatever, without any analogy to the course of proceedings in England by which the judgment of impartial persons acquainted with the law is secured, the Bishop pronounces sentence of deprivation.

On this occasion, as on the former, the sentence seems to have been founded on what are termed repeated acts of disobedience and contempt by Mr. Long, instead of on the single charge which he was called upon by the citation to meet.

We cannot say, therefore, that the proceedings in this case have been conducted in a proper manner, though our Judgment rests on the other grounds already stated.

We have been much embarrassed by the question how we ought to deal with the costs in this case. We do not doubt that the Bishop has acted in the conscientious discharge of what he considered to be his public duty, and he has succeeded, at great personal trouble and expense, in bringing this contention in the Court below to a favourable issue. On the other

hand, it is impossible not to feel that Mr. Long has been subjected to probably not less trouble and expense by a course of proceeding on the part of the Bishop which we have been obliged to pronounce not warranted in law.

Feeling the hardship of the case upon the Right Reverend Respondent, we still think that we are bound to award the costs of the suit and of the Appeal to the Appellant. We cannot, of course, suggest to Her Majesty any consideration of what it may be fit to do, at the expense of the public; for this is beyond our province. But it is not beyond our province to observe that the Lord Bishop has been involved in the difficulties by which he has been embarrassed in a great measure by the doubtful state of the law and by the circumstance that he, not without some reason, considered the Letters-Patent under which he acted to confer on him an authority which, at the time when he acted under them, Her Majesty had no authority to grant, and that either in this or in some other suit it was important to the interests of the Colony generally, and especially of the members of the Church of England within it, that the many questions which have arisen in this case should, as far as possible, be set at rest.

Appendix II.—Vol. II. p. 75.

THE CITATION.

To the Right Reverend John William Colenso, Doctor in Divinity, Lord Bishop of Natal, and a Suffragan Bishop of the Province of Cape Town.

My Lord—By direction of the Lord Bishop of Cape Town, I hereby cite you to appear before the Most Reverend Robert, Lord Bishop of Cape Town and Metropolitan, on Tuesday, the seventeenth day of November, one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three, at eleven o'clock in the forenoon, in the vestry of the cathedral church of Saint George, Cape Town, then and there to answer to certain charges of false, strange, and erroneous doctrine and teaching, preferred against you by the Very Reverend the Dean of Cape Town, the Venerable the Archdeacon of Graham's Town, and the Venerable the Archdeacon of George, to wit, that in and by the writing, printing, and publishing, and the sale within this Province of a certain book or work, entitled "Saint Paul's Epistle to the Romans, newly translated and explained from a missionary point of view, by the Right Rev. J. W. Colenso, D.D., Bishop of Natal. Printed at Ekukanyeni, Natal, 1861:"

And in and by the writing, printing, and publishing, and thereafter the sale within this Province of a certain other book or work, entitled "The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua critically examined, by the Right Rev. John William Colenso, D.D., Bishop of Natal. London, Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts, and Green, 1862," being Part I. of said work. And in and by the writing, printing, and publishing, and thereafter the

sale within this Province of Part II. of said book or work last mentioned, entitled "The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua critically examined, by the Right Rev. John William Colenso, D.D., Bishop of Natal. Part II. London, Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts, and Green, 1863:" Your Lordship did, in and by such writings and publications, in whole or in part, hold, maintain, set forth, teach, inculcate, and express belief, doctrines, views, and opinions in opposition to and at variance with the doctrine and teaching of the United Church of England and Ireland, as set forth, expressed, and maintained in the Book of Common Prayer, the Sacraments, and other rites of the said Church, the 39 Articles of Religion, and the Canons Ecclesiastical; the several portions or extracts from the said writings and publications containing the erroneous and strange doctrine, contrary to God's word, so complained of as aforesaid, and the charges thereon being hereto annexed, marked with the letters A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, and K, including the schedules marked from No. I. to IX. inclusive.

Should your Lordship fail to appear, either in person or by proctor, or otherwise make default herein, the Bishop of Cape Town, as Metropolitan, with the advice and assistance of such of the Suffragan Bishops of the Province as can conveniently be called together, will, after proof of the due service of this citation, hear and investigate, at the time and place aforesaid, the charges so preferred against your Lordship, and proceed to the final adjudication thereon.

Dated at Cape Town, this eighteenth day of May, A.D. 1863.

I remain,

Your Lordship's obedient servant,

DAVID TENNANT, Registrar of the Diocese of Cape Town.

AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE.

"I, DOUGLAS DU BOIS, of Doctors' Commons in the City of London, proctor, solicitor, and notary public, make oath, and say, as follows:

"That I duly and personally served the above named, the Right Reverend John William Colenso, D.D., Bishop of Natal, with the citation dated eighteenth May, one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three (whereof a copy is above written), together with the charges and schedules thereto annexed, marked respectively from A to K, and from I. to IX., both inclusive; to wit, by delivering to and leaving with his Lordship the said original citation, with said charges and schedules annexed, at No. 23 Sussex Place, Kensington, in the county of Middlesex, on the first day of July, one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three.

"DOUGLAS DU BOIS.

"Sworn by the said Douglas du Bois at the Mansion-house, in the city of London, this first day of July 1863, before me,

"WM. A. ROSE, Mayor."

APPENDIX III.—Vol. II. p. 75.

Annexure A.

THE LETTER OF THE DEAN AND ARCHDEACONS.

To the Most Reverend ROBERT GRAY, D.D., Lord Bishop of Cape Town and Metropolitan.

MY LORD—We, the undersigned, being Clerks in Holy Orders of the United Church of England and Ireland, and having cure of souls within the Province of Cape Town, under your Lordship's Metropolitan jurisdiction, constrained by a sense of duty to the Church within which we hold office, desire to lay before your Lordship a charge of false teaching on the part of the Right Reverend John William Colenso, Doctor in Divinity, Lord Bishop of Natal, and a Suffragan Bishop of this Province.

The charge which we bring is founded upon certain extracts from writings published and put forth by the Bishop, entitled, "*S. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, newly translated and explained from a missionary point of view;*" and Parts I. and II. of the "*Pentateuch and Book of Joshua critically examined,*" and sold and published in the city of Cape Town within the last two years.

These extracts are contained in nine schedules, and a copy of them is hereto annexed, numbered from I. to IX. inclusive.

I. With respect to the eight, all and each of them which stand first, we charge the Bishop of Natal with holding and promulgating opinions which contravene and subvert the Catholic faith as defined and expressed in the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, and the Formularies of the Book of Common Prayer of the United Church of England and Ireland.

And, accordingly, under each schedule of extracts, we have specified the particular article or articles and other portions of the Church's symbols and formularies, which, we are persuaded, those extracts contravene, and which we crave may be considered as if herein inserted and word for word repeated.

II. With respect to the extracts contained in the ninth schedule, we charge the Bishop of Natal with depraving, and impugning, and otherwise bringing into disrepute the Book of Common Prayer, particularly portions of the Ordinal and the Baptismal Services, and in so doing with violating the law of the United Church of England and Ireland, as contained in the 36th of the Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical. We are deeply conscious of the gravity of these charges, as brought against one who holds the office of a Bishop, and of the responsibility which we incur in making them; but the scandal which these publications have caused, and the feelings which are entertained regarding them by the clergy of the Province generally, seemed imperatively to require that we should lay them before your Lordship, and ask for your judgment upon the doctrines which are therein maintained.

It only remains for us to inform your Lordship that we are prepared, if required, to prove the charges which we bring, and further to request that an opportunity may be afforded us of proving them at such time and in such manner as your Lordship may see fit to appoint.

Dated at Cape Town the 6th, and at Graham's Town the 12th day of May, in the year of our Lord 1863.

We are, my Lord,

Your Lordship's faithful servants,

H. A. DOUGLAS, Dean of Cape Town.
N. J. MERRIMAN, Archdeacon of Graham's Town.
H. BADNALL, Archdeacon of George, and Rector of S. Mark's, George Town.

Before reading the schedule of charges the Registrar received from the Dean the works containing the alleged erroneous passages, and then proceeded as follows :

ARTICLES OF ACCUSATION.

Schedule I.

Extracts from "S. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, newly translated and explained from the missionary point of view." Edition, printed at Ekukanyeni, Natal, 1861.

Articles and Formularies contravened in the Extracts contained in Schedule I.

Article ii.
Article xxxi.

Pages 93, 150, v. 6.—"On behalf of.—Once for all, let it be stated distinctly there is not a single passage in the whole of the New Testament which supports the dogma of modern theology, that our Lord died for our sins, in the sense of dying instead of us, dying in our place, or dying so as to bear the punishment or penalty of our sins."

Prayer of Consecration in the Order of the Administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion. —"Almighty God, Our Heavenly Father, who, of Thy tender mercy, didst give Thine only Son, Jesus Christ, to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption ; who made there (by His one oblation of Himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world."

Pages 95, 156, v. 10.—"We were reconciled to God by the death of His Son.—The language of S. Paul is 'God hath reconciled us to Himself by the death of His Son.' 'God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself.' It is not He who needs to be reconciled to us ; for He loves us all along. It is we, poor, sin-stricken creatures, who need to be reconciled, brought back to Him. And in order to this, as the first step to this, we need to be assured of His love to us." . . .

Page 97.—"Let the expression, however, once more be noted. The Apostle does not say that God is reconciled to us by the death of His Son,

but that we are reconciled to God. The difference in the meaning of these two expressions is infinite. It is our unwillingness, fear, distrust, that is taken away by the revelation of God's love to us in His Son. There is nothing now to prevent our going, with the prodigal of old, and throwing ourselves at His feet, and saying, 'Father, I have sinned; but Thou art love.'"

Pages 110, 176.—"He died not instead of us: but He died for us, on our behalf."

The charge preferred is that, in the extracts contained in Schedule I., the writer maintaining that Our Blessed Lord did not die in man's stead, or bear the punishment or penalty of our sins, and that God is not reconciled to us by the death of His Son, impugns and contradicts the Catholic faith as expressed in the Articles, etc., above set forth and referred to.

Schedule II.

Extracts from "S. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, newly translated, and explained from a missionary point of view." Edition printed at Ekukanyeni, Natal, 1861.

Pages 62, 112, v. 23.—"Being made righteous freely through His grace. As he has just said that all sin, and all come short of God's glory, so now he must mean that all are made righteous, justified freely by the grace of God. In former days the Jews were all 'made righteous,' treated as righteous, though many of them individually were unfaithful. They were all embraced in God's favour, and dealt with as children, not for any works of righteousness which they had done, nor for any virtue they possessed in themselves as descendants of Abraham, but because of God's free grace, which had called them before others to the knowledge of His truth, and the present enjoyment of His gift of righteousness, — a gift, however, which was intended for all mankind, and was actually, in fact, bestowed from the first upon them, though as yet they knew it not, for it was not yet revealed to them. But now it

Articles and Formularies contravened in the Extracts contained in Schedule II.

Article xi.
Article xviii.
Article xix.

The Apostles' Creed: "I believe . . . the Holy Catholic Church, the communion of saints."

Nicene Creed: "And I believe one Catholic and Apostolic Church, I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins."

The 3d collect for Good Friday.

The collect for All Saints.

The Ministration of Public Baptism of Infants to be used in the Church.

The Ministration of Private Baptism of Children in Houses.

The Ministration of Baptism to such as are of Riper Years, and able to answer for themselves.

The Hymn called the *Te Deum Laudamus.* — "When Thou hadst overcome the sharpness of death, Thou didst open the kingdom of heaven to all believers."

The Order of the Administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion.—(Second prayer in Post-Communion service) — "Almighty

is revealed that this gift of righteousness is meant for all, that all are being made righteous (the Greek present implying their continuing state of righteousness),—all men, everywhere, though many may be unfaithful, who have heard the blessed tidings, and many more may not yet have heard them, and so may have little or no present enjoyment of their Father's love.

"The Apostle's words in this verse most probably mean this, because he afterwards (v. 15-19) fully and explicitly states it, namely that the justification here spoken of extends to all, to those who have never heard the name of Christ, and who cannot have exercised a living faith in Christ, as well as to Christians. It is certain that, in this latter passage, he is speaking of the whole human race."

Pages 74, 120, v. 30.—"Who will make righteous.—It should be observed that both here and elsewhere, when the Apostle says that God justifies any, or 'makes them righteous,' he means, that he justifies them in their own consciences, he brings home to them consciously the gift of righteousness." . . .

and everlasting God . . . very members incorporate in the mystical body of thy Son, which is the blessed company of all faithful people."

A Catechism, that is to say, an Instruction to be learned of every Person before he be brought to be confirmed by the Bishop.—"Question: Who gave you this name?

"Answer: My godfathers and godmothers in my baptism, wherein I was made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of Heaven.

"Question: What is the inward and spiritual grace?

"Answer: A death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness; for being by nature born in sin, and the children of wrath, we are hereby made the children of grace.

"Question: What is required of persons to be baptized?

"Answer: Repentance, whereby they forsake sin; and faith, whereby they steadfastly believe the promises of God made to them in that sacrament."

Page 75.—"And all of them, as St. Paul plainly teaches afterwards, are counted as righteous creatures, though they may not know it, through the grace of God, bestowed upon the whole human race, in His own dear Son whom He has given to be their Head, and whose members they are.

Pages 103, 171, v. 19.—"Whenever the 'unrighteousness' of any Jew, Christian, or Heathen, 'is forgiven, and his sin covered,' whenever he feels any measure of the peace of God's children, in the faithful discharge of any duty or in forsaking any path of evil,—whenever there is brought home to his heart in any way the message of God's fatherly love by means of any one of earth's ten thousand voices,—then he hears, as it were, a fresh declaration of righteousness, he may know that he is recognised again as a child of God's house."

Pages 114, 180, v. 4.—"Of course, it is true that we ought to do so; but just because we have already died unto sin, and risen again unto righteousness in our very birth-hour, through the gracious gift of God, by

that mysterious union with Christ our Head, which we all enjoy through the grace of our Heavenly Father as members of the great human family, and by virtue of which we are partakers of the death which He died, and of the life which He now lives."

The charge preferred is that, in the extracts contained in Schedule II. the writer maintaining that justification is a consciousness *of being counted righteous, and that all men, even without such consciousness, are treated by God as righteous, and counted righteous, and that all men, as members of the great human family, are dead unto sin and risen again unto righteousness, denies that men are justified by faith, and impugns and contradicts the Catholic faith as expressed in the Articles, etc., above set forth and referred to.*

Schedule III.

Extracts from "S. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, newly translated, and explained from a missionary point of view." Edited at Ekukanyeni, Natal, 1861.

Pages 114, 180, v. 4. — "We also should walk in newness of life.— Though his words are true in their measure (v. 15-21) of all mankind, yet the Apostle is specially speaking here of Christians, to whom their baptism is a sign and seal of their share in the death of their Lord, and also in His resurrection-life. This is expressed in the Church Catechism by saying that the inward spiritual grace, or free gift of favour, which is given us in baptism, is 'a death unto sin,' 'and a new birth unto righteousness.' These words of the catechism are often explained to signify that in our baptism is set forth to us our duty to die unto sin, to mortify and kill all vices in us, and so to walk in holiness of life as becomes God's dear children. Of course it is true that we ought to do so; but just because we have already died unto sin, and risen again unto righteousness, in our very birth-hour, through the gracious gift of God, by that mysterious union with Christ our Head, which we all

Articles and Formularies contravened in Schedule III.

Article xxvii.

The Nicene Creed. — "And I believe one Catholic and Apostolic Church; I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins."

The Ministration of Public Baptism of Infants to be used in the Church.

The Ministration of Private Baptism of Children in Houses.

The Ministration of Baptism to such as are of Riper Years, and able to answer for themselves.

A Catechism, that is to say, an Instruction, to be learned of every Person, before he be brought to be confirmed by the Bishop. — "Question: Who gave you this name?

"Answer: My godfathers and godmothers in my baptism, wherein I was made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of Heaven.

"Question: How many sacraments hath Christ ordained in his Church?

"Answer: Two only as generally necessary to salvation, that is to say, baptism and the supper of the Lord.

"Question: What is the inward and spiritual grace?

"Answer: A death unto sin and

enjoy through the grace of our Heavenly Father, as members of the great human family, and by virtue of which we are partakers of the death which He died, and of the life which He now lives. That is, the 'death unto sin,'—our share in our Lord's own 'death unto sin,'—and that is the 'new birth unto righteousness,'—our share in our Lord's own 'life unto God' (Rom. vi. 10)—which are said to be given to us as the inward spiritual grace, set forth to us by the outward visible sign in our baptism." . . .

a new birth unto righteousness, for being by nature born in sin and the children of wrath, we are hereby made the children of grace.

"Question: What is required of persons to be baptized?

"Answer: Repentance, whereby they forsake sin; and faith, whereby they steadfastly believe the promises of God made to them in that sacrament."

The Order of Confirmation (Collect preceding imposition of hands).—"Almighty and Everlasting God, who hast vouchsafed to regenerate these Thy servants by water and the Holy Ghost."

Page 115.—"But the point now to be noticed is that the 'inward spiritual grace' is not the effect wrought upon ourselves by coming to the holy sacrament, depending, therefore, on the spirit in which we come to it, but the Body and Blood of Christ, which are graciously given to us of God, which we may, or may not, faithfully partake of; which are given to us, however, and to all the human race, not only in the sacrament, but at all times, and of which, in fact, all men are everywhere partaking, through God's mercy, and so receiving all the life they have, as redeemed creatures, whether they feed upon it by living faith or not, whether they know the precious gift of God's grace or not, whether they heed or disregard it."

The charge preferred is that, in the extracts contained in Schedule III. the writer maintaining that all men have the new birth unto righteousness in their very birth-hour, that is to say, are regenerated when born into the world, as members of the great human family; and, also, that all men are at all times partaking of the body and blood of Christ, denies that the holy Sacraments are generally necessary to salvation, and that they convey any special grace, and further denies that faith is the means whereby the body and blood of Christ is received and eaten, and that faith is necessary in order that the grace bestowed by God in sacraments may have a wholesome effect and operation, and therefore impugns and contradicts the Catholic faith as expressed in the Articles, etc., above set forth and referred to.

Schedule IV.

Pages 175, 261, v. 21.—"That the creature also itself shall be set free from the bondage of corruption, into the freedom of the glory of the children of God.—I cannot shut my eyes to the truth, which these words appear so clearly to imply, that there

Articles and Formularies contravened in the Extracts contained in Schedule IV.

The Creed of Saint Athanasius.—"And they that have done good shall go into life everlasting; and they that have done evil into everlasting fire."

is hope in the counsels of Infinite Wisdom and Love for all; for all 'the creature,' for the whole human race, that fell in Adam and has been graciously redeemed in Christ. The children of God, the faithful and true of all ages, all lands, all religions, will be revealed, will receive their glorious freedom in the kingdom of their Lord. While others, perhaps the great mass of human kind, who have been wilfully unfaithful, in greater or less degree, to the light vouchsafed to them, and are still willingly held in the bondage of corruption, though they might have asserted their freedom from it, and lived as good men and true, with the grace vouchsafed to them, will receive their righteous judgment unto condemnation,—indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that worketh out evil. But this chastisement, after all, comes from a father's hand upon those who may be wilful, prodigal, unruly, disobedient, but yet are creatures, whom He Himself has redeemed, for whom Christ died. Can we say, with those words of S. Paul before us, that such chastisement, however severe, may not be remedial, may not be intended to work out the hope, under which the whole race has been subjected to vanity, which hope, in the Apostle's mind, is the justification of the eternal justice and love, in so subjecting it when it had not deserved such a fate, nor brought it about of its own accord by any act of its own? Is there not ground from this text, as well as others, for trusting that in some way unknown to us, the whole race shall be made to share this hope at last, and so be set free from the bondage of corruption, into

The Absolution or Remission of Sins.—"Wherefore, let us beseech Him to grant us true repentance, and His Holy Spirit, that those things may please Him which we do at this present, and that the rest of our life hereafter may be pure and holy, so that at the last we may come to His eternal joy, through Jesus Christ our Lord."

The Catechism.—"Question: What desirest thou of God in this prayer?

"Answer: I desire my Lord God our Heavenly Father, who is the Giver of all goodness, to send His grace unto me and to all people; and I pray unto God that He will keep us from all sin and wickedness, and from our ghostly enemy, and from everlasting death."

The Order for the Burial of the Dead.—"O merciful God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is the resurrection and the life, in whom whosoever believeth shall live though he die; and whosoever liveth and believeth in Him shall not die eternally."

A Commination.—"The day of the Lord cometh as a thief in the night." Then shall it be too late to knock when the door shall be shut, and too late to cry for mercy when it is the time of justice. O terrible voice of most just judgment, which shall be pronounced upon them, when it shall be said unto them: 'Go, ye cursed, into fire everlasting, which is prepared for the devil and his angels.' . . . . . This if we do, Christ will deliver us from the curse of the law, and from the extreme maledictions which shall light upon them that shall be set upon the left hand, and give us the gracious benediction of his Father,

the freedom of the glory of the children of God? commanding us to take possession of His glorious kingdom."

"I feel it necessary to say more on this subject. There was a time when I thought and wrote otherwise. Some years ago, in the year 1853, I published a small volume of 'Village Sermons,' which I dedicated to a dear and honoured friend, the Rev. F. D. Maurice, and which was violently attacked, in consequence of this dedication, by those who had previously assailed Mr. Maurice's teaching, as containing what seemed to them erroneous statements of doctrine, and particularly as expressing agreement with Mr. Maurice's views on the subject of 'eternal punishment.' I was able to show, by quotations from my little book itself, that these charges were untrue, and that I had given offence partly by stating larger views of the redeeming love of God in Christ Jesus than the reviewer of my sermons himself thought it right to hold (though views by such men as Barrow and Macknight), but chiefly by expressing my cordial sympathy with Mr. Maurice in his noble and blessed labours. In particular, I was able then to show that, in several places in those very sermons, I had distinctly spoken of eternal punishment in terms directly at variance with those which my friend would have used, and in exact conformity with the views of my reviewer. Accordingly, in the preface to the second edition of his 'Theological Essays,' Mr. Maurice spoke of me as having proved by my sermons that I believed in the endlessness of future punishments. I did believe in that dogma at the time I wrote and printed those sermons,—so far as that can be called belief which, in fact, was no more than acquiescence in common, I imagine, with very many of my brother clergy in the ordinary statements on the subject, without having ever deeply studied the question, probably with a shrinking dread of examining it and without having ever ventured formally to write or preach a sermon upon the subject, and pursue it, in thought and word, to all its consequences. There are many who, as I did myself in those days, would assert the dogma as a part of their 'creed,' and now and then, in a single sentence of a sermon, utter a few words in accordance with it, but who have never set themselves down to face the question, and deliver their own souls upon it to their flocks, fully and unreservedly. For my own part, I admit I acquiesced in it, seeing some reasons for assuming it to be true, knowing that the mass of my clerical brethren assented to it with myself, and contenting myself with making some reference to it, now and then, in my ministrations, without caring to dwell deliberately upon it and considering what might be urged against it.

"The controversy which arose about Mr. Maurice's essays and my own little volume of sermons brought the whole subject closely before me. And for the last seven years I have carefully studied it, with an earnest desire to know the truth of God upon the matter, and with an humble prayer for the guidance and teaching of His Holy Spirit in the search for it. I now declare that I can no longer maintain or give utterance to the doctrine of the endlessness of 'future punishments,'—that I dare not dogmatise at all on the matter—that I can only lay my hand upon my mouth,

and leave it in the hands of the Righteous and Merciful Judge. But I see that the word 'eternal' does not mean 'endless.' And for such reasons as the following I entertain the 'hidden hope' that there are remedial processes, when this life is ended, of which at present we know nothing, but which the Lord the Righteous Judge will administer, as He in His wisdom shall see to be good." . . .

Page 186.—"Seeing, then, that we can recognise, even for some of those who in the main are good and true, a possibility, rather a probability, and even a necessity of 'stripes,' and a presumption, almost amounting to certainty, of growth and progress, an upward, onward tendency in the state of spiritual being in the world to come, we may reasonably recognise something of the same kind as possible in the case of all, of the whole human race, who (as S. Paul says in the text before us) 'shall one day be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the freedom of the glory of the children of God.' He who has been pleased to subject them to their present state has 'subjected them in hope' of this. Stripes more or less, according to the judgment of the All-knowing and All-righteous, may be, and doubtless will be, appointed in His wisdom and mercy, for those who need them; 'indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish,' must be the portion—our own hearts plainly tell us this, as well as the Bible—of every one who 'keepeth back the truth in unrighteousness,' of every one who 'worketh out evil.' We bow to this rule as holy and righteous; we glorify God for it; we rejoice, even while self-condemned ourselves, at the very idea of such a judgment as this. But, that utter, unspeakable misery should be the portion, for endless ages, for ever and ever, alike of all, who are not admitted at first into the realms of infinite joy—that there shall be no hope, in the horrible outer darkness, for the ignorant young child of some wretched outcast, who has been noted by the teachers of the ragged or the Sunday School as having contracted some evil habit, it may be, of lying, stealing, swearing, or indecency, any more than for the sensual libertine, who has spent a long life in gratifying his lusts, and has been the means of that child, and others like it, being born in guilt and shame, and nursed in profligacy, our hearts, taught as they are by God's Spirit, instinctively revolt at such a dogma as a blasphemy upon the name and character of the High and Holy One, and refuse to believe it, though a thousand texts of Scripture should be produced which may seem at first sight to assert it." . . .

Page 193.—"How is it possible that the judgment in one case should be more tolerable than in the other, if in both the same ingredient is found which is the very essence of the woe of hell, as popularly understood, namely, the horror of helpless, hopeless misery in utter, dark despair, shut out for endless ages from any possibility of ever seeing again one single ray of the light of God's mercy? And what right have we poor, wretched, ignorant creatures of the dust thus to limit the mercies of our God, to bind Him down to our narrow notions, and positive interpretations of one or two passages of Scripture, when yet the whole tenor of the Sacred Book, and other separate passages, and our human hearts also,

with their best and strongest utterances, are manifestly teaching us a different lesson? If, indeed, the 'eternal fire' be the ever-burning wrath of a Holy Being against all sin, that is, against all wilful evil, so long as that evil continues to exist, it is conceivable that they who sinned against their better light and knowledge in Sodom and Gomorrha, and they that have similarly sinned under the Gospel, may alike be subjected to the vengeance of that fire; and that, on those who had more light given them than others, and have most abused it, the judgments will be sorer and more permanent."

Page 280 (note on 262).—"There will he perish everlastingly—and will lie perishing, until that Father sees the work is done. In the cold and gloom of night he will lie, in the outer darkness, shut out from home, and the place where God's brighter glory shines, while the faithful ones are admitted within, and the children look upon their Father's face, and rejoice in His love; or to use the other figure, he will pass into that 'eternal fire,' which is ever burning to destroy all evil things in God's kingdom. And there, too, will he lie till God sees that the work is done, the wood, and hay, and stubble consumed, the filth purged away and the pure gold left, or silver, or precious stone, which even in the heart of that sinful child the Father's eye can see.

"I do not assert that this is what was meant by the writer of the creed; for it bears the stamp, as I have said, of a harsh and intemperate age, when men were too ready to consign each other to endless perdition."

The charge preferred is that, in the extracts contained in Schedule IV. the writer maintaining that he cannot any longer maintain or give utterance to the doctrine of the endlessness of future punishments, impugns and contradicts the Catholic faith as expressed in the Articles, etc., above set forth and referred to.

Schedule V.

Extracts from "The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua critically examined."

Pages 152, 184.—"Let us rather teach them to look for the sign of God's Spirit, speaking to them in the Bible, in that of which their own hearts alone can be the judges, of which the heart of the simple child can judge as well as—often, alas! better than—that of the self-willed philosopher, critic, or sage,—in that which speaks to the witness for God within them, to which alone, under God Himself, whose voice it utters in the secrets of His inner being, each man is, ultimately responsible,

Articles and Formularies contravened in the Extracts contained in Schedule V.

Article vi.

Article xvii. — "Furthermore, we must receive God's promises in such wise as they be generally set forth to us in Holy Scripture, and in our doings that will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared unto us in the Word of God."

Article xx. . . . . "To ordain anything that is contrary to God's Word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another."

—to the reason and conscience. Let us bid them look for it in that within the Bible, which tells them of what is pure and good, holy and loving, faithful and true, which speaks from God's Spirit directly to their spirits, though clothed with the outward form of a law, or parable, or proverb, or narrative,—in that which they will feel and know in themselves to be righteous and excellent, however they may perversely choose the base and evil,—in that which makes the living man leap up, as it were, in the strength of sure conviction which no arguments could bring, no dogmas of church or council enforce, saying, as the Scripture words are uttered, which answer to the voice of truth within, 'These words are God's,'—not the flesh, the outward matter, the mere letter, but the inward core and meaning of them,—for they are spirit, they are life."

Pages 383, 513.—"The Bible is not itself 'God's word,' but assuredly 'God's word' will be heard in the Bible, by all who will humbly and devoutly listen for it."

Pages 13, 14.—"And that truth in the present instance, as I have said, is this, that the Pentateuch, as a whole, was not written by Moses, and that with respect to some, at least, of the chief portions of the story, it cannot be regarded as historically true. It does not on that account cease to 'contain the true word of God,' to enjoin things necessary for salvation, to be profitable for doctrine, reproof, correction, instruction in righteousness. It still remains an integral portion of that Book, which, whatever intermixture it may show of human elements,—of error, infirmity, passion, and ignorance and to confute them that were adversaries to the truth; and, further, that the people (by daily hearing of Holy Scripture read in the church) might continually profit more and more in the knowledge of God, and be the more inflamed with the love of His true religion.

Article xxii. . . . . "Grounded upon no warrants of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God."

Article xxiv.—"It is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God."

Article xxxiv.—"So that nothing be ordained against God's Word."

Preface to the Book of Common Prayer; Concerning the Service of the Church.—"For they so ordered the matter, that all the whole Bible (or the greatest part thereof) should be read over once every year; intending thereby, that the clergy, and especially such as were ministers in the congregation, should (by often reading and meditation in God's Word) be stirred up to godliness themselves, and be more able to exhort others by wholesome doctrine, and to confute them that were adversaries to the truth; and, further, that the people (by daily hearing of Holy Scripture read in the church) might continually profit more and more in the knowledge of God, and be the more inflamed with the love of His true religion.

"But these many years passed, this godly and decent order of the ancient fathers hath been so altered, broken, and neglected, by planting in uncertain stories and legends. . . It is more profitable, because here are left out many things, whereof some are untrue, some uncertain, some vain and superstitious; and nothing is ordained to be read, but the very pure word of God, the Holy Scriptures, or that which is agreeable to the same."

Exhortation of the beginning of Morning and Evening Prayer.—"When we assemble and meet together to render thanks for the

rance, has yet, through God's providence, and the special working of His Spirit on the minds of its writers, been the means of revealing to us His true name, the name of the only living and true God, and has long been, and, as far as we know, will never cease to be, the mightiest instrument in the hand of the Divine Teacher for awakening in our minds just conceptions of His character, and of His gracious and merciful dealings with the children of men. Only we must not attempt to put into the Bible what we think ought to be there: we must not indulge that 'forward delusive faculty,' as Bishop Butler styles the 'imagination,' and lay it down for certain beforehand that God could only reveal himself to us by means of an *infallible* book. We must be content to take the Bible as it is, and draw from it those lessons which it really contains.

Preface to Part I., page xii.—"For myself, if I cannot find the means of doing away with my present difficulties, I see not how I can retain my episcopal office, in the discharge of which I must require from others a solemn declaration that they 'unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament,' which, with the evidence now before me, it is impossible wholly to believe in."

The charge preferred is that, in the extracts contained in Schedule V., the writer maintaining that the Holy Scriptures contain *the word of God, but are not the word of God, impugns and contradicts the Catholic faith as expressed in the Articles, etc., above set forth and referred to.*

Schedule VI.

Extracts from "The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua critically examined."

Page 152, part of Section 183.—"In view of this change, which I believe is near at hand, and in order to avert the shock which our children's faith must otherwise experience, when they find, as they certainly will before long, that the Bible can no longer be regarded as infallibly true in matters of common history,—as we value their reverence and love for the sacred book, let us teach

Articles and Formularies contravened in the Extracts contained in Schedule VI.

The Nicene Creed—"And I believe in the Holy Ghost, ... who spake by the prophets."

Article vi.

Article vii.

Article xvii.—"Furthermore, we must receive God's promises in such wise as they be generally set forth to us in Holy Scripture; and in our doings that will of God is to be followed which we have expressly

them at once to know that they are not to look for the inspiration of the Holy One, which breathes through its pages, in respect of any such matters as these, which the writers wrote as men, with the same liability to error from any cause as other men, and where they must be judged as men, as all other writers would be, by the just laws of criticism."

Pages 186, 224.—"We must next endeavour to arrive at some clearer notion, from an examination of the books of the Pentateuch themselves, as to the time when, the persons by whom, and the circumstances under which, they were most probably written. And, in pursuing our investigation we need not be restrained by any fear of trespassing upon divine and holy ground. The writers of these books, whatever pious intentions they may have had in composing them, cannot now be regarded as having been under such constant *infallible* supernatural guidance as the ordinary doctrine of Scripture inspiration supposes. We are at liberty, therefore, to draw such inferences from the matter which lies before us, and to make such conjectures, as we should be readily allowed to do in a critical examination of any other ancient writings.

Page 382, part of Section 511.—"In this way, I repeat, the Bible becomes to us a human book, in which the thoughts of other hearts are opened to us, of men who lived in the ages long ago, and in circumstances so different from ours."

Page 382, part of Section 512.—"We must not blindly shut our eyes to the real history of the composition of this book, to the legendary character of its earlier portions, to the manifest contradictions and impossibilities which rise up at once in every part of the story of the Exodus, if we persist in maintaining that it is a simple record of historical facts. We must regard it, then, as the work of men, of fellow-men like ourselves, fighting the same good fight on the side of God and His Truth, against all manner of falsehood and evil, though fighting in their own primitive way, and without the light of that Christian teaching which shines upon our warfare of to-day, and makes many things plain and clear to our eyes which to them were still dark and uncertain." 513.—"But then, on the other hand, we must study the Bible with the *heart* as well as with the mind. The Bible is not itself 'God's word,' but assuredly 'God's word' will be heard in the Bible by all

declared unto us in the Word of God."

Article xx. . . . "To ordain anything that is contrary to God's Word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another."

Article xxii. . . . "Grounded upon no warrants of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God."

The Ordering of Priests.—"Then the Bishop shall deliver to every one of them kneeling, the Bible into his hand, saying, 'Take thou authority to preach the Word of God.'"

The Consecration of Bishops.—"The Archbishops: Are you ready, with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's Word; and both privately and openly to call upon and encourage others to the same?

"Answer: I am ready, the Lord being my helper."

who will humbly and devoutly listen for it. Undoubtedly, it is a fact which can never be lost sight of by thoughtful men, that the Jewish nation has been singled out, by the express will of God, from all other nations for this great end, to be the instrument by which His more clear and full revelations of Himself should be in the earliest days conveyed to mankind, and thus be the special messenger of His grace and goodness to all the ends of the earth. As the Greeks have been endowed by the 'Father of Light' with those special gifts in art and science and literature which have made the works of their great masters in all ages the models for the imitation of mankind,—as the Roman has been distinguished in matters of law and government, and other nations have had their own peculiar endowments for the common welfare of the race; so, too, has the Hebrew mind had its own special gift from God."

Page 380, Section 508.—"But some one, perhaps, may now say, 'Do you then take from us God's word—the Bible?'—I must reply again, 'Whatever is done, it is not I, but the truth itself which does it.' If the arguments which I have advanced are not really founded upon truth, let them be set aside and thrown to the winds; but if they are, we dare not, as servants of God, do this; we are bound to hear and to obey the truth. It may be then—rather it is, as I believe, undoubtedly—the fact, that God Himself, by the power of the truth, will take from us in this age the Bible as an idol which we have set up against His will, to bow down to it, and worship it. But, while He takes it away thus with the one hand, does He not also restore it to us with the other,—not to be put into the place of God and served with idolatrous worship, but to be reverenced as a book—the best of books—the work of living men like ourselves,—of men, I mean, in whose hearts the same human thoughts were stirring, the same hopes and fears were dwelling, the same gracious Spirit was operating, three thousand years ago, as now?"

Page 9, part of Section 9.—"I then clung to the notion that the main substance of the narrative was historically true; and I relieved this difficulty and my own for the present by telling him that I supposed that such words as these were written down by Moses and believed by him to have been divinely given to him, because the thought of them arose in his heart, as he conceived, by the inspiration of God, and that hence to all such laws he prefixed the formula, 'Jehovah said unto Moses,' without it being on that account necessary for us to suppose that they were actually spoken by the Almighty."

Page 351, Section 466.—"It is conceivable that the recollections of that terrible march may have left indelible traces on the minds of the people, and may have been exaggerated, as is the case with legends generally, while circulated in their talk, and passed on by word of mouth from sire to son in the intervening age. In this way natural facts may have been magnified into prodigies, and a few thousands multiplied into two millions of people. It is quite possible that the passage of the Red Sea, the manna, the quails, and other miracles, may thus have had a real historical foundation, as will be shown more fully in our critical review of the differ-

ent books of the Pentateuch. And Samuel may have desired to collect these legends and make them the basis of a narrative, by which, he being dead, might yet speak to them with a prophet's voice, and while rejected by them himself as a ruler, might yet be able patriotically to help forward their civil and religious welfare under kingly government, and more especially under the rule of his favourite, David, whose deep religious feeling accorded with his own sentiments so much more fully than the impetuous, arbitrary character of Saul. His annual journeys of assize, when 'he went from year to year on circuit to Bethel, and Gilgal, and Mizpeh, and judged Israel in all those places' (1 Sam. vii. 16), would have given him good opportunities for gathering such stories, as well as for knowing thoroughly the different parts and places of the country to which such legends were attached. He may have spent a great deal of his life, especially the latter part of it, since Saul came to the throne and he was himself relieved from the cares of government, in the elaboration of such a work as this, filling up from his own mind, we may conceive, the blanks left in such legendary accounts, and certainly imparting to them their high religious tone and spiritual character."

Page 368, Section 485.—"The preceding investigations have led us to the conclusion that the Pentateuch most probably *originated* in a noble effort of one illustrious man, in an early age of the Hebrew history, to train his people in the fear and faith of the Living God. For this purpose he appears to have adopted the form of a history, based upon the floating legends and traditions of the time, filling up the narrative, we may believe,—perhaps to a large extent,—out of his own imagination, where those traditions failed him. In a yet later day, though still, probably, in the same age, and within the same circle of writers, the work thus begun, which was, perhaps, left in a very unfinished state, was taken up, as we suppose, and carried on in a similar spirit by other prophetical or priestly writers. To Samuel, however, we ascribe the Elohistic story, which forms the groundwork of the whole, though comprising, as we shall show hereafter, but a small portion of the present Pentateuch and Book of Joshua,—in fact, little besides about half of the book of Genesis, and a small part of Exodus." Section 486.—"But in order to realise to ourselves, in some measure, the nature of such a work as that which we here ascribe to Samuel, we may imagine such a man as Asser, in the time of King Alfred, sitting down to write an accurate account of events which had happened four centuries before, when different tribes of Saxons, under Hengist and Horsa, and other famous leaders—the old Saxons, Angles, Jutes, etc., all kindred tribes—came over the sea at different times, in larger or smaller bodies, and took possession of the land of Britain. Yet Samuel's sources of information for the composition of such a history must have been far less complete than those which the Anglo-Saxon author would have had before him, when writing was so common, and, midway between the times of Hengist and Alfred, Venerable Bede had composed his history. The Saxon chronicler, however, has no difficulty in filling up a genealogy, and traces up that of Alfred, through Odin and his progenitors, to Bedwig, who was the son of Sceaf, who

was the son of Noah ; he was born in Noah's Ark !—*Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, Bohn's edition, page 350."

Page 374, Section 498.—"It is true that the Elohist has set the example of introducing in his narrative the Divine Being Himself, as conversing with their forefathers, and imparting laws to Moses,—though not, indeed, the minute directions of the ceremonial laws in Leviticus and Numbers, for these, we shall find, are all due to later writers. But, in this respect, he has only acted in conformity with the spirit of his age, and of his people, which recognised, in their common forms of language, a direct Divine interference with the affairs of men. The case, indeed, would have been different, if the writer had stated that these Divine communications had been made to himself, that God had spoken to him in his own person, instead of to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and had revealed laws to him, instead of to Moses. It would have been different, also, if he had claimed for all he wrote Divine infallibility,—if he had professed to have received these early records of the race by special inspiration, so that every part of the story which he recorded must be received with unquestioning faith as certainly true." Section 499.—"But there is not the slightest reason to suppose that the first writer of the story in the Pentateuch ever professed to be recording infallible truth, or even actual historical truth. He wrote certainly a narrative. But what indications are there that he published it at large, even to the people of his time, as a record of matter-of-fact, veracious history ? Why may not Samuel, like any other head of an institution, have composed this narrative for the instruction and improvement of his pupils, from which it would gradually find its way, no doubt, more or less freely, among the people at large, without ever pretending that it was any other than an historical experiment, an attempt to give them some account of the early annals of their tribes ? In later days, it is true, this ancient work of Samuel's came to be regarded as infallibly Divine. But was it so regarded in the writer's days, or in the ages immediately following ?"

Page 262, part of Section 339.—"Is it not possible, then, that the name Jehovah may have been first employed by Samuel, in order to mark more distinctly the difference between the Elohim of the Hebrews and the Elohim of the nations round them, and make it more difficult for them to fall away to the practice of idolatry ?" Section 340.—"Certainly, it would be much more easy and natural to suppose, if that were not contradicted by the actual evidence in the case before us, that Samuel, or whoever else composed the Elohistic document, found the name already in use among his people, and with some legendary traditions attached to it, as to the way in which it was first made known to them by Moses during their march through the wilderness. If it were right to wish any such fact of history to be other than it really is, one would rather desire such a solution of the present difficulty, and gladly embrace it. But a firm and honest adherence to the plain results of critical inquiry, as set forth in the following chapters, will not allow of our making this supposition. They seem to compel us to the conclusion that the name was quite new to the Hebrew people in the days

of Samuel ; and, if so, we can scarcely avoid the inference that he himself must have first introduced it."

Page 339, part of Section 446.—"My own conviction, however, from the accumulated evidence of various kinds before us, is that Samuel was the first to form and introduce the name, perhaps in imitation of some Egyptian name of the Deity which may have reached his ears."

The charge preferred is that, in the extracts contained in Schedule VI. the Holy Scriptures are spoken of and treated as a merely human book, not inspired by God the Holy Spirit, or inspired only in such a manner as other books may be inspired, and that so to speak and treat of the Holy Scriptures is to impugn and contradict the Catholic faith as expressed in the Articles, etc., above set forth and referred to.

Schedule VII.

Extracts from "The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua critically examined."

A.

Page xvii., Preface to Part I.—"Being naturally unwilling, in my present position as a Bishop of the Church, to commit myself even to a friend on so grave a subject, if it could possibly be avoided, I determined to detain my letter when written, for a time, to see what effect further study and consideration would have upon my views. At the end of that time,—in a great measure by my being made more fully aware of the utter helplessness of Kurtz and Hengstenberg, in their endeavours to meet the difficulties which are raised by a closer study of the Pentateuch,—I became so convinced of the unhistorical[1] character of very considerable portions of the Mosaic narrative, that I decided not to forward my letter at all. I did not now need counsel or assistance to relieve my

Articles and Formularies contravened in the Extracts contained in Schedule VII.

Article vi.
Article vii.
Article xx.

The Ordering of Deacons.—"The Bishop—Do you unfeignedly believe all the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament ?

"Answer.—I do believe them."

The Ministration of Public Baptism.—(First Prayer).—"Almighty and Everlasting God, who of thy great mercy didst save Noah and his family in the Ark from perishing by water ; and also didst safely lead the children of Israel, thy people, through the Red Sea, figuring thereby thy holy baptism."

Prayer for Fair Weather.—"O Almighty Lord God, who for the sin of man didst once drown all the world, except eight persons, and afterwards of Thy great mercy didst promise never to destroy it so again."

Prayer in the time of any

[1] Page xviii., note to Preface, Part I.—"I use the expression 'unhistorical,' or, 'not historically true throughout,' rather than 'fictitious,' since the word 'fiction' is frequently understood to imply a conscious dishonesty on the part of the writer, an intention to deceive ; yet in writing the story of the Exodus from the ancient legends of his people, the Scripture writer may have had no more consciousness of doing wrong or of practising historical deception than Homer had, or any of the early Roman annalists."

own personal doubts; in fact, I had no longer any doubts; my former misgivings had been changed to certainties. The matter was become much more serious. I saw that it concerned the whole Church,—not myself, and a few more only, whose minds might have been disturbed by making too much of minor difficulties and contradictions, the force of which might be less felt by others. It was clear to me that difficulties such as those that are set forth in the first part of this book would be felt and realised in their full force by most intelligent Englishmen, whether of the clergy or laity, who should once have had them clearly brought before their eyes, and have allowed their minds to rest upon them. I considered, therefore, that I had not a right to ask of my friend privately beforehand a reply to my objections, with respect to which, as a Divinity Professor, he might, perhaps, ere long be required to express his opinion in his public capacity.

"This conviction which I have arrived at, of the certainty of the ground which the main argument of my book rests (viz., the proof that the account of the Exodus, whatever value it may have, is not historically true), must be my excuse to the reader for the manner in which I have conducted the inquiry."

Common Plague or Sickness.—"O Almighty God, who in thy wrath didst send a plague upon thine own people in the wilderness, for their obstinate rebellion against Moses and Aaron."

The Order of the Administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion.—"Then shall the Priest, turning to the people, rehearse all the ten commandments."

"Minister: God spake these words, and said I am the Lord thy God. Thou shalt have none other Gods but me."

Catechism.—"Question: Which be they?

"Answer: The same which God spoke in the twentieth chapter of Exodus, saying, I am the Lord thy God who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage."

The Order of the Administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion.—"Exhortation for giving warning for the celebration of the Holy Communion.

"Therefore if any of you be a blasphemer of God, an hinderer or slanderer of His word . . . . repent you of your sins, or else come not to that holy table."

Page xx. Preface to Part I.—"If my conclusions, indeed, were only speculations, if they were only matters of higher or lower probability, I feel that I should have no right to express them at all in this way, and thus, it may be, disturb painfully the faith of many. But the main result of my examination of the Pentateuch,—namely, that the narrative, whatever may be its value and meaning, cannot be regarded as historically true,—is not—unless I greatly deceive myself—a doubtful matter of speculation at all; it is a simple question of facts."

Page 8, part of Section 7.—"The result of my inquiry is this, that I have arrived at the conviction—as painful to myself at first, as it may be to my reader, though painful now no longer, under the clear shining of the light of truth—that the Pentateuch, as a whole, cannot possibly have

been written by Moses, or by any one acquainted personally with the facts which it professes to describe, and, further, that the (so-called) Mosaic narrative, by whomsoever written, and though imparting to us, as I fully believe it does, revelations of the Divine will and character, cannot be regarded as historically true."

Page 10, part of Section 9.—"This was, however, a very great strain upon the cord which bound me to the ordinary belief in the historical veracity of the Pentateuch; and since then that cord has snapped in twain altogether." Section 10.—"But I wish to repeat here most distinctly that my reason for no longer receiving the Pentateuch as historically true, is not that I find insuperable difficulties with regard to the miracles or supernatural revelations of Almighty God recorded in it, but solely that I cannot, as a true man, consent any longer to shut my eyes to the absolute, palpable self-contradictions of the narrative."

Page 11, part of Section 11.—"For the conviction of the unhistorical character of the (so-called) Mosaic narrative seems to be forced upon us by the consideration of the many absolute impossibilities involved in it, when treated as relating to simple matters of fact."

Page 348, Section 462.—"Thus then, even if it were conceivable that Moses should have written a story about matters in which he was personally concerned, involving such contradictions, exaggerations, and impossibilities, as we have already had before us, yet the fact above noticed would alone be decisive against such a supposition. The great body of the Pentateuch, and all the other historical books which follow it, could not have been compiled until the name Jehovah was in common popular use, and that was not until after, at all events, the middle of David's reign. Whereas the Elohistic portions of the Pentateuch, which appear to have been composed when the name Jehovah was not in common use, and with the very purpose of commending it to popular acceptation, must have been written during, or shortly before, the earliest part of David's life, when that word was only occasionally employed by him. Hence we may, with very good reason, abide by our supposition that they were written very probably by the hand, or, at least, under the direction, and certainly in the time of Samuel."

Page 371, part of Section 491.—"And to such as these I reply, It is not I who require you to abandon the ordinary notion of the Mosaic authorship and antiquity of the Pentateuch. It is the truth itself which does so."

Page xviii. Preface to Part II.—"Now let us consider what this leads to. Let us suppose a clergyman to begin to 'inquire,' having a difficulty about the Deluge put before him by some intelligent layman of his flock. If he does this, he will assuredly soon learn that the results of geological science absolutely forbid the possibility of our believing in an universal deluge, such as the Bible manifestly speaks of. He will find, also, that mathematical and physical science, as well as the plain texts of Scripture, equally forbid our believing in a partial deluge, such as some have supposed, since that involves an universal flood. Rather, without any appeal to

science at all, if only he allow himself to think upon the subject, and to realise to his own mind the necessary conditions of the supposed event, he will need only a common practical judgment to convince him that the story which is told in the book of Genesis is utterly incredible."

Page xx. Preface to Part II.—"On all the above grounds, then, and for many other similar reasons, which the least acquaintance with scientific facts, or common sense itself, will soon suggest to him, if he once begins to 'inquire,' it is extremely probable that any such clergyman must needs come very soon to doubt, and before long to disbelieve, the truth of the Scripture account of the Deluge."

Page 169, part of Section 201.—"We shall see the utter impossibility of receiving any longer this story of the Exodus as literally and historically true, whatever real facts may lie at the basis of the narrative. The one only cause, indeed, for astonishment is this—not that a Bishop of the Church of England should now be stating that impossibility—but that it should be stated now, by a Bishop of the Church, as far as I am aware, for the first time; that such a belief should have been so long acquiesced in by multitudes, both of the clergy and the laity, with an unquestioning, unreasoning faith; that up to this very hour, in this enlightened age of free thought, in this highly civilised land, so many persons of liberal education actually still receive this story in all its details—at least, in all its main details—as historical matter of fact, and insist on the paramount duty of believing in the account of the Exodus, among the 'things necessary to salvation,' contained in the Bible, as essential to an orthodox faith in the True and Living God."

Page 262, part of Section 339.—"In fact, from what we have already seen of the unhistorical character, generally, of the account of the Exodus, we have no longer any reason for supposing it to be necessary to believe that the name Jehovah really originated in the way described in E. vi."

B.

Page 349, part of Section 463.—Ans.: "According to our view, Joshua was only a mythical or, perhaps, legendary personage, whose second name, compounded with Jehovah, certainly originated in an age earlier than that of Samuel. At all events, there is no evidence that this new name was popularised; that it ever did obtain universal acceptance; that Joshua ever was a well-known popular hero."

C.

Page 332, part of Section 455.—"The stories in the book of Judges are also, like the story of the Exodus, most probably founded upon some real traditions; and, though in some places they are evidently exaggerated, and in others they have assumed a legendary form, and the chronology throughout is the despair of the 'reconciling' school of theologians; yet the heroes, whose exploits are there described, seem to have been real characters, and their names, in most cases, may be supposed to be genuine."

Page 343, Section 452.—"We conclude, then, that the 'Song of

Deborah' was written after Psalm lxviii., that is, after the middle part of David's life, perhaps towards the close of it, two or three centuries after the time of Barak and Deborah, by a writer who, except in the free use of the word Jehovah, has produced an admirable imitation of an ancient song, a 'Lay of Ancient Israel,' and thrown himself thoroughly into the spirit of the age which he describes."

D.

Page 196, Section 236.—"For our present purpose, however, it is sufficient to observe, as above noted (235), that the author of the Book of Chronicles must have been, to all appearance, a Priest or Levite, who wrote about B.C. 400, nearly two hundred years after the Captivity, B.C. 588, and six hundred and fifty years after David came to the throne, B.C. 1055.

"This must be borne in mind when we come to consider the peculiarities of this book, and the points in which the narrative differs from, and often contradicts, the facts recorded in the Book of Samuel and Kings. We have already had occasion to point out some of its inaccuracies, and we shall see, as we proceed, further reason for believing that the chronicler's statements, when not supported by other evidence, are not at all to be relied on."

The charge preferred is that, in the extracts contained in Schedule VII. the authenticity, genuineness, and truth of certain books of Holy Scripture in whole or in part are denied; and that, by this denial, the authority and canonicity of these books in whole or in part are called in question, and denied in contravention of the Catholic faith, as expressed in the Articles, etc., above set forth and referred to.

Schedule VIII.

Extract from "The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua critically examined."

Page xxxi. Preface to Part I. (iii.)—"Lastly, it is perfectly consistent with the most entire and sincere belief in our Lord's Divinity, to hold, as many do, that, when He vouchsafed to become a 'Son of Man' He took our nature fully, and voluntarily entered into all the conditions of humanity, and, among others, into that which makes our growth in all ordinary knowledge gradual and limited. We are expressly told, in Luke ii. 52, that 'Jesus increased in wisdom, as well as in stature.' It is not supposed that, in His human nature, He was

Articles and Formularies contravened in the Extracts contained in Schedule VIII.

Article ii.

Nicene Creed.—"And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, begotten of His Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, Very God of Very God."

Creed of Athanasius.—"Furthermore, it is necessary to everlasting salvation that He also believe rightly the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. For the right faith is, that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and Man; God, of the substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds; and Man, of the substance

acquainted, more than any educated Jew of the age, with the mysteries of all modern science; nor, with S. Luke's expressions before us, can it be seriously maintained that, as an infant or young child He possessed a knowledge, surpassing that of the most pious and learned adults of His nation, upon the subject of the authorship and age of the different portions of the Pentateuch. At what period, then, of His life upon earth is it to be supposed that He had granted to Him, as the Son of Man, supernaturally, full and accurate information on these points, so that He should be expected to speak about the Pentateuch in other terms than any other devout Jew of that day would have employed? Why should it be thought that He would speak with certain Divine knowledge on this matter, more than upon other matters of ordinary science of history?"

of His mother, born in the world; perfect God, and perfect Man; of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting; equal to the Father, as touching His Godhead: and inferior to the Father, as touching his Manhood; who, although He be God and Man, yet He is not two, but one Christ; One, not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking of the Manhood into God; one altogether, not by confusion of substance, but by unity of Person. For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man; so God and Man is one Christ."

The charge preferred is that, in the extracts contained in Schedule VIII. the writer maintaining that Our Blessed Lord was ignorant and in error upon the subject of the authorship and age of the different portions of the Pentateuch, denies the doctrine that Our Blessed Lord is God and Man in one person, and by this denial impugns and contradicts the Catholic faith, as expressed in the Articles, etc., above set forth and referred to.

Schedule IX.

Extracts from "The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua critically examined."

Page 149, Section 178—"And it may be that the time is near at hand, in the ordering of God's Providence, when the way shall be opened for a wide extension of missionary work among the heathen; when that work, which now languishes, which cannot make progress among them, either among the ignorant Zulu or the learned Hindoo, shall no longer be impeded by the necessity of our laying down, at the very outset, stories like these, for their reception, which they can often match out of their own traditions, and requiring them, upon pain of eternal misery, to believe in them all 'unfeignedly;' and when a missionary Bishop of the Church of England shall not be prevented, as I myself have been, from admitting to the Diaconate a thoroughly-competent, well-trained, able, and pious native, who had himself helped to translate the whole of the New Testament and several books of the Old, because he must be ordained by the formularies of the Church of England, and those require that he should not only subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles, and acknowledge the Book of Common

Prayer—parts of which, the nice distinctions of the Athanasian Creed, for instance, cannot possibly be translated into his language—but solemnly declare, in the presence of God and the congregation, that he unfeignedly believes in canonical Scriptures, some part of which, as the genealogies in Chronicles, and the Books of Esther and Daniel, as well as large portions of the prophecies, he had never read."

Page xx. Preface to Part II.—"On all the above grounds, then, and for many other similar reasons, which the least acquaintance with scientific facts, or common sense itself, will soon suggest to him, if he once begins to 'inquire,' it is extremely probable that any such clergyman must needs come very soon to doubt, and before long to disbelieve, the truth of the Scripture account of the Deluge. Rather let me ask, Does any intelligent clergyman at this day—any one who has allowed himself to 'think' upon the subject as he would think about any other recorded fact of ancient history—really believe in that story? Do the Bishops and Doctors of the English Church believe in it? If they do not, then do not these divines, one and all, 'disbelieve the Church's doctrine' on this particular point; whilst yet, in common with all their fellow-clergy, they use habitually that solemn form of address to Almighty God in the Baptismal Service, which expressly assumes the reality and historical truthfulness of the story of the Noachian Deluge—'Almighty and Everlasting God, who, of Thy great mercy, didst save Noah and his family in the ark from perishing by water'? It is of no avail to say, 'There was a deluge of some kind or other, and this is only a legendary reminiscence of it.' The Church Prayer Book does not mean this. When those formularies were laid down, and the clergymen were bound by a solemn subscription to declare their 'unfeigned assent and consent to all things written in the Book of Common Prayer,' it was assuredly meant to bind them to express an unfeigned belief in the story of the Deluge, as it is told in these chapters of Genesis, and not to some imaginary flood of any kind, which any one may choose at his pleasure to substitute for it; otherwise, it would be very easy to explain away in like manner every single statement of the Scriptures, Old and New, which we cannot believe. But the fact is that, by the present law of subscription, each clergyman is bound by law to believe in the historical truth of Noah's flood, as recorded in the Bible, which the Church believed in some centuries ago; and he will be so bound, till the Legislature of the realm shall relax the painful obligation, and relieve him from the duty, to which he now stands pledged, of using a form of prayer which involves such a statement as this. Are, then, all these—prelates as well as ordinary clergy—to resign at once their sacred offices because they disbelieve the Church's doctrine on this point?

"But what are they to do under these circumstances—those, I made, who have their eyes open to the real facts of the case, and who cannot bear to utter what they know to be untrue in the face of God and the congregation? Many, probably, will get rid of the difficulty, with satisfaction to their own minds in some way, by falling back on the notion above referred to, that the account in Genesis is a legendary narrative, however incorrect

and unhistorical, of some real matter of fact in ancient days. Others—though I imagine not many—will justify themselves in still using such a form of prayer, though they know it to be unreal and unmeaning, by considering that they are acting in a merely official capacity as ministers of the National Church and administrators of the laws which the main body of the Church has approved and has not yet rescinded.

"But what shall be said to those who cannot conscientiously adopt either of the above methods of relieving themselves from the burden of the present difficulty, and yet feel it to be impossible to continue any longer to use such words in a solemn address to the Almighty? I see no remedy for these but to omit such words, to disobey the law of the Church on this point, and take the consequences of the act, should any over-zealous brother clerk or layman drag them before a court, and enforce a penalty in the face of an indignant nation. It is true that a soldier is bound, as a general rule, to obey his commanding officer, and a servant his master; but there are times when a faithful servant is bound, as he loves his master and cherishes his best interests, to disobey his orders. A master may, in ignorance of the real circumstances of the case, or, perhaps, from want of forethought, or from the mere infirmity of age, issue an unwise or injurious command—one that, if carried out, would in the end be ruinous, and even fatal, to his own safety. He may have issued it long ago, under a totally different state of things, for which he had then most wisely provided. But now, under changed circumstances, such an order may be most ill-judged, and the attempt to enforce it irrational and suicidal. In such a case the most true and trusty servant would deem it right to disobey—would be bound to disobey—though the consequences of the act might bring ruin on himself, should his master, in his blindness or obstinacy, not appreciate his motives. On the other hand, it may be that the master in such a case, however angry and even violent at first, when he sees only the outward act of disobedience, and does not yet recognise the spirit of true faithfulness which prompted it, and the real danger from which he had been saved by it, will at length awake from his delusion, and gratefully acknowledge the righteousness and truth of the course of conduct which he before condemned. Just such, I apprehend, is the state of many of us at present with reference to our relations as clergy to the National Church. At the time when we were admitted into her ministry, we heartily believed what we then professed to believe, and we gave our assent and consent to every part of her Liturgy. But we did not bind ourselves to believe thus always to the end of our lives. God forbid that it should be supposed by any that the Church of England had committed so great a sin, as to bind in this way, for all future time, the very consciences of her clergy. But we engaged in her service, it is true, upon certain conditions, in virtue of which we were subject to her laws, and amenable to her courts in case of disobedience. If, therefore, in obedience to a higher law than that of the National Church,—if in obedience to the law of truth, which is the law of God,—if, in dearest love to our spiritual mother, and truest sense of duty towards her, we now feel it necessary to

disobey, deliberately, any one of her directions, we must be prepared of course, for the consequences of such an act, which, in her present state of ignorance as to the real facts of the case, and the perilous dangers which threaten her, she may choose to inflict upon us. In the end, we know we shall be justified for the very acts which may now be condemned.

"But will they be condemned by the great body of intelligent laity? Is not this the way by which, in England, all laws become disused and practically abrogated, long before they are formally and legally annulled? At this moment, how many are there of the clergy who never read the Athanasian Creed? And do their Bishops compel them to do so? Should, however, a prosecution be set on foot in such a case, and a clergyman be suspended or expelled from the Church of England, because he could not bear to approach the holy presence of God by addressing Him as the Being, who of His great mercy did take Noah and his family in the ark from perishing by water, then may we sooner attain the freedom which is needed to make the Church of England what it professes to be, the National Church, and to realise the principle which, however lost sight of and practically ignored in these days, is yet involved in the very fact that her Bishops are seated in Parliament, not surely as the heads of a mere sect, but as the representatives of the whole community, in its religious capacity, and therefore, in these days, of every form of earnest religious thought within the realm."

Page xxviii. Preface to Part II.—"Let the laity answer the above questions for themselves, and then ask themselves the reason of this. It is not because the clergy, bound by their ordination vows and the fetters of subscription, either dare not think at all on such subjects, or, if they do, dare not express freely their thoughts from the pulpit, or by means of the press, without incurring the awful charge of 'heresy,' and the danger of being dragged into the Ecclesiastical Court by some clerical brother who has himself no turn—perhaps no faculty—for thinking, or who has else abandoned his rights and duties as a reasoning man, to become the mere exponent of a Church system or a creed, but who will, at least, prevent others from exercising their powers of thought in the inquiry after truth, and so disturbing the quiet repose of the Church. How, in fact, can it be expected that a clergyman should venture to 'think' on these subjects when by so doing he is almost certain to come to doubt and disbelieve some portion, at least, as we have seen above, of the Church's doctrines; and then he may feel bound to follow his own sense of duty, if it accords with the sentiments expressed by the Bishop of London, and abandon voluntarily the ministry of the Church, deprived of all share in its duties and emoluments, yet burdened still with the necessity, according to the present state of the law, of dragging about with him, for his whole life long, his clerical title and its legal disqualifications for engaging in other duties of active life, for which his temper, abilities, or circumstances may fit him, sacrificing thus the means of livelihood for himself and his family, after work, it may be, for many long years well done, and with strength still, and a hearty will, to do more in the Church's service, if

only he may be allowed to think and speak the plain honest truth as a free man, and not be required to hush up the facts which he knows, and publish and maintain, in place of them, by silence, at all events, if not by overt act, transparent fictions?

The charge preferred under the extracts contained in Schedule IX. is fully set forth in Section II. of the letter addressed to the Metropolitan, being the Annexure A.

Appendix IV.—Vol. II. p. 75.

Cape Town, 16th November 1863.

To David Tennant, Esq.,
Registrar of the Diocese of Cape Town.

Sir—We beg to notify to you, for the information of the Lord Bishop of Cape Town, that we intend at the hearing of the charges preferred by us against the Right Reverend John William Colenso, D.D., Bishop of Natal, to avail ourselves of and to use as evidence in support of said charges the following documents, letters, and writings as filed with you, to wit:

1. Declaration by the Very Reverend the Dean of Cape Town, as to the sale within the Province of Cape Town of the books and works referred to in the citation.

2. The Letters-Patent of the 8th December 1853, constituting the See of Cape Town.

3. The Letters-Patent of the 23d November 1854, constituting the See of Natal, being an office copy, extracted from the Principal Registry of the Archiepiscopal See of Canterbury, together with the profession of obedience to the Metropolitan thereto annexed.

4. The *Natal Gazette* of the 14th February 1854, containing the publication of the Letters-Patent of the Bishop of Natal, with the Proclamation by the Governor of the 11th February 1854.

5. Extract from the "Pastoral Letter from the Bishop of Natal to the Clergy and Laity of the Diocese," dated Maritzburg, October 1, 1855.

6. Extracts from a letter dated "Bishopstowe, Maritzburg, March 2, 1858," addressed by the Bishop of Natal to the Metropolitan Bishop of Cape Town.

7. Extracts from a letter dated "Bishopstowe, Maritzburg, April 3, 1858," addressed by the Bishop of Natal to the Metropolitan Bishop of Cape Town.

8. Extracts from a printed letter dated "Bishopstowe, August 11, 1858," addressed by the Bishop of Natal "to the Clergy and Laity of the United Church of England and Ireland in the Diocese of Natal."

9. Extract from a letter dated "Bishopstowe, Maritzburg, August 2, 1858," addressed by the Bishop of Natal to the Metropolitan Bishop of Cape Town.

10. Extract from a letter dated "Bishopstowe, November 19, 1858,"

addressed by the Bishop of Natal to the Metropolitan Bishop of Cape Town.

11. Extracts from a postscript to a letter dated "Bishopstowe, December 31, 1858," addressed by the Bishop of Natal to the Metropolitan Bishop of Cape Town.

12. Extracts from a postscript to a letter dated "Bishopstowe, March 7, 1859," addressed by the Bishop of Natal to the Metropolitan Bishop of Cape Town.

13. Minutes of proceedings at a meeting of the Metropolitan and Suffragan Bishops of the Province of Cape Town, held at Cape Town on the 26th December, 1860, and following days.

14. Letter dated "Bishopstowe, Natal, June 1st, 1863," addressed by the Venerable Archdeacon Grubb, of Maritzburg, the Bishop of Natal's Commissary, to the Metropolitan Bishop of Cape Town, with the copy of an address by the clergy of Natal to the Bishop of that Diocese, as enclosed in said letter.

And we have to request that a copy of this notice may be served on Dr. W. H. I. Bleek, the Bishop of Natal's agent.

We remain, Sir, your obedient Servants,

H. A. Douglas, Dean of Cape Town.
N. J. Merriman, Archdeacon of Graham's Town.
H. Badnall, Archdeacon of George.

The Registrar then produced the documents referred to, which he read as follows:

[1.]

I, Henry Alexander Douglas, Dean of Cape Town, do solemnly and sincerely declare that a certain book or work, entitled "S. Paul's Epistle to the Romans newly translated and explained from a missionary point of view, by the Right Reverend John William Colenso, D.D., Bishop of Natal," was sold and advertised for sale in Cape Town, in the *Argus* newspaper of the 25th September, 1862, and in the said month of September, 1862, exposed for sale at the publishing office of the *Cape Argus* in Adderley Street, Cape Town.

And I do further solemnly and sincerely declare that the certain book or work entitled "The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua critically examined, by the Right Reverend John William Colenso, D.D., Bishop of Natal," being Part I. of said work, was likewise sold and advertised for sale in Cape Town in the *Argus* newspaper of the 20th December, 1862, and 25th of December, 1862, and at the dates so advertised was exposed for sale at the shop of J. C. Juta, of Wale Street, Cape Town, bookseller and stationer, and that the said Part I. of the last-named work was also advertised for sale by Messrs. Davis and Son, of Pietermaritzburg, Natal, in a certain newspaper published at Pietermaritzburg, Natal, and styled the *Natal Witness and Agricultural and Commercial Advertiser*, of the 6th February, 1863, and in said advertisement described as "By the Right Reverend

the Lord Bishop of Natal, the Pentateuch shown to be unhistorical;" and in the *Natal Witness and Agricultural and Commercial Advertiser*, of the 1st of May, 1863, Part II. of the said work was advertised for sale at Messrs. Davis and Son, Pietermaritzburg, Natal, and in said advertisement described as "Bishop Colenso on the Pentateuch," as will be seen from the copies of these papers hereto annexed, marked A and B.

(Signed) H. A. DOUGLAS.

Declared at Cape Town, this 16th day of November, 1863, before me,

(Signed) DAVID TENNANT,
Justice of the Peace for Cape Town.

[2.]

Letters-Patent, 8th December, 1853.

[3.]

Letters-Patent, 23d November, 1854.

I, John William Colenso, Doctor in Divinity, appointed Bishop of the See and Diocese of Natal, do profess and promise all due reverence and obedience to the Metropolitan Bishop of Cape Town, and to his successors, and to the Metropolitical Church of S. George, Cape Town. So help me God, through Jesus Christ. (Signed) J. W. NATAL.

[4.]

Natal Gazette and Proclamation, 14th February, 1854.

[5.]

Pastoral Letter from the Bishop of Natal to the Clergy and Laity of the Diocese.

My Brethren in Christ— Maritzburg, October 1, 1855.

1. I have the pleasure to lay before you a copy of an address which has just reached me from the Bishop, Clergy, and Laity of the Metropolitan Church of Cape Town to those of the Church of Natal, expressing, as you will see, the deep interest they take in the great work to which we have been called.

[6.]

Bishopstowe, Maritzburg, March 2, 1858.

. . . . . I am afraid you will be grieved this mail by a communication from the Dean. Of what kind it will be, I cannot, of course, say beforehand; but the simple fact is that I am directly at issue with him on the subject of our Lord's real presence in the Holy Eucharist, and that I feel bound to protest against the views he holds, to the utmost of my power. . . . . But these things are trifles, compared with what will cause you much greater pain, whether you agree with my views or differ from them. May God guide and comfort and keep you, in this and all the other many trials by which, I fear, your path is beset. . . . .

[7.] April 3, 1858.

By this mail you will receive from me a copy of the sermons which I have preached on the Holy Eucharist, and another I expect from the Dean. What your own views are on the subject in question I know not. . . . . I am grieved that you should be troubled in this matter, when you have so much else to trouble you ; but unless I am judged and deposed as a heretic, I must live and die preaching the doctrines of these sermons in this my post of duty, and it will be miserable to feel that every sermon I preach will sound to the Dean as heresy. . . . . I need hardly say that, under such circumstances, it will be impossible for us to work together with any cordiality henceforward. . . . . And if I am not myself to be removed from my office, heartily glad should I be if one of them would present him with a good living in England. . . . .

[8.]

Printed letter "To the Clergy and Laity of the United Church of England and Ireland, in the Diocese of Natal."

My Brethren in Christ— August 11, 1858.

You are aware that in the early part of this year, the Very Rev. the Dean of Maritzburg and the Rev. Canon Jenkins formally presented me, their Bishop, to the Metropolitan Bishop of Cape Town, charging me with unsound and heretical teaching on the subject of the Holy Eucharist, in consequence of two sermons which I felt it my duty at that time to preach in the cathedral church of this diocese, and subsequently to publish for the information and, I would humbly trust, the edification of my flock. As you must naturally be desirous to know what are the views of the Metropolitan upon the point in question, I think it right to say that a reply has been received from him, in which, while declining to pronounce an official judgment upon the matter, he yet gives his opinion on the main subject, in the following words. . . .

Such being the opinion of the Metropolitan on this point, I conclude that there must be passages in my sermons which are liable to be thus misrepresented.

[9.] August 2, 1858.

You will see that one of our resolutions requests me to ascertain how this stands from the *Primate.* I need hardly say that the reference was made to him, rather than to yourself, from no want of respectful sense of duty to you as Metropolitan, but because it was considered that a question of this nature, which was not of the nature of an appeal from a judicial decision, but one of inquiry respecting the principles of the Church of England, ought more properly to be addressed to the Primate. . . .

[10.] November 19, 1858.

In respect of his last letter to yourself, Mr. Jenkins has, no doubt, been influenced to take the course he has adopted mainly in consequence of that passage in your letter to the Dean in which you say that you

think a clergyman is at liberty to present his Bishop—or rather your expression is, "Presbyters" may, for grave matters, present a Bishop. The expression, as it stands, is no doubt liable to the interpretation which Mr. Jenkins, Mr. Crompton, and others, have put upon it, but against which I most respectfully but most firmly protest, on the ground of Church order, and common propriety, viz. that a single Presbyter, or two or three Presbyters, of a diocese may present a Bishop. I say on the ground of Church order, because I find that the American Church, who have doubtless well considered authorities in this matter, beyond what, with the limited means at my command, I am able to do, have laid it down as a rule that a *Bishop*, or two-thirds of the clergy, alone can present a Bishop. And this precedent appears to me to be confirmed by a sense of common propriety. . . .

[11.] December 31, 1858.

I hope that when the Bench of Bishops meets they will take into consideration the question of metropolitical jurisdiction, as well as the constitution of Church councils. . . . . So, too, I use the word Province of the South African dioceses, but only in a popular way. I see clearly Canon Jenkins, and probably the Dean, does not—but looks upon you as an independent Metropolitan. That you would be, doubtless, if you were Metropolitan by Church authority, and not by Royal Patent. But it seems to me that we are really still in a certain sense within the *Province* of Canterbury, by virtue of the clause which makes your proceedings subject, not merely to the supervision, but to the *revision*, of the Primate. To take for example an instance. Suppose that of a clergyman, who had signed adherence to our present rules of council. . . . I found it necessary, because of some infringement of the rules, to pass a sentence of suspension, and he appealed to you, and you (as you say you should do) reversed my proceeding, of course I must submit to this, as the Bishop of Exeter to the Archbishop in the case of Mr. Gorham; but I imagine that I should do right to appeal to the Archbishop, not to *reverse*, but to *revise* your decision, and that if he decided against you, you would be bound in conscience to follow that judgment in case of any future appeal of a similar kind. This is the way in which our mutual relation at present presents itself to my own mind. But it would be most desirable that the whole matter should be settled for us by the proper authorities in England.

[12.] March 7, 1859.

You say that you regret my sanctioning my clergy and laity writing to the Archbishop. It was not to ask advice of him, however, that they wrote, nor did it occur to me that they were doing anything which appeared to put a slight on your office as Metropolitan. They only wished to be properly understood in England, and, without making any request for the Archbishop's opinion, simply stated to him the facts of the case. . . .

Nevertheless I am sorry that I sanctioned *this* letter being written if it has pained you. . . .

[13.]

Minutes of proceedings at a meeting of the Metropolitan and Suffragan Bishops of the Province of Cape Town.

(Signed) R. Cape Town.
J. W. Natal.
Piers S. Helena.
H. Graham's Town.

[14.]

Bishopstowe, Natal, June 1, 1863.

To the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Cape Town.

My Lord—It is my duty to forward to your Lordship, as Metropolitan, the enclosed, of which a duplicate copy will be sent by the mail now leaving to the Bishop of Natal.

I think it right to add that this document has not been sent to Zululand for the signature of the clergy there, and that of the four licensed clergy in Natal who have not signed it none have any sympathy with the views to which it alludes.

I have the honour to be,
My Lord,
Your faithful servant,
C. L. Grubb.

To the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Natal.

We, duly licensed clergy, ministering in the diocese of Natal, desire to address your Lordship upon a matter of the utmost importance to the Church planted in this colony.

We have heard, with the deepest pain, of a work published by you, in which you state in effect that you no longer hold, believe, nor are able to teach, some, at least, of the most vital of the doctrines of the united Church of England and Ireland.

We consider that in our relative positions, it would have ill become us to have been the first to draw attention to acts of yours done before the whole world, and therefore we remained silent until those in authority in our Church had publicly marked their sense of your Lordship's proceeding.

But we understand that a very large majority of the Archbishops and Bishops having written to you suggesting the propriety of your resigning your office, you have answered that it is not your intention to comply with that suggestion.

Under these circumstances, we consider that a longer silence on our part would be most culpable.

There are, we are aware, legal questions which it belongs to others to

decide, but we feel that we have a duty independently of any merely legal proceedings.

The various offices which we hold, the emoluments we receive, are held on the faith of our upholding and defending the doctrines of the Church of England, and on that understanding only could we honestly and conscientiously continue to hold those offices or to receive those emoluments.

Unfeignedly believing all the Canonical Scriptures of the "New and Old Testament," and bound to "banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's Word," we feel compelled, in the sight of God and His Church, and more especially before "the people committed to our care and charge," to protest most solemnly against the position taken by you in the publication of this book, and your determination to retain the office of Bishop; and we think it right to lay this our protest before the ecclesiastical authority to whom, next to your Lordship, we must look, the Metropolitan Bishop of Cape Town.

We are,

Your Lordship's faithful servants,

C. L. Grubb, M.A., Archdeacon of Maritzburg.
William Henry Cynric Lloyd, Colonial Chaplain, Rector of Durban.
[1] James Walton, Pinetown.
A. Tounesen, Ungaboba.
W. Baugh, Umbazi.
W. A. Elder.
Joseph Barker.
A. W. L. Rivett, Addington.

Appendix V.—Vol. II. p. 76.

My Lord—As duly authorised thereto by the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Natal, I appear before your Lordship for the purpose of protesting against your Lordship's present assumption of jurisdiction over the Bishop of Natal, and to repudiate your Lordship's assumed right to take cognisance of the charge of "false teaching" preferred against the Bishop of Natal by the Very Reverend the Dean of Cape Town, the Venerable the Archdeacon of Graham's Town, and the Venerable the Archdeacon of George.

On behalf of the Bishop of Natal, I therefore protest accordingly against the proceedings now instituted against him before your Lordship, and I request you to take notice that he does not admit their legality; and,

[1] Mr. Walton, after the words "our care and charge," would continue, "to avow our unaltered adherence to the doctrines of our Church as found in our Articles and authorised Formularies, believing them to be in accordance with God's Holy Word; and the office which your Lordship holds, and the opinions you avow, appear to us to be greatly at variance with consistency, accompanied as it is with an intimation on the part of your Lordship that you can no longer use the Formularies to which you have subscribed."

further, that he will, if necessary, take such measures to contest the validity of your proceedings, and to resist the execution of any judgment which your Lordship may see fit to pronounce, in such manner as the Bishop shall be advised. W. H. I. BLEEK.

Cape Town, 17th November 1863.

APPENDIX VI.—Vol. II. p. 87.

Bishopstowe, Aug. 7, 1861.

MY DEAR BROTHER—I thank you sincerely for your letter on the subject of my Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. I cannot be surprised at your writing so earnestly and seriously, holding the views which you do on some of the points which I have discussed. But, as you will have learned from my last letter, it is too late now to stop the publication of the book, even if I desired to do so. Whatever you may think it right to say or do in the matter, I am quite sure that you will only act from a sense of duty to what you believe to be the truth, which compels you to set aside all personal feelings, in obedience to a higher law. In writing what I have written, and publishing it, I too have done the same, though conscious that I should thereby cause pain to yourself, and others, whom I entirely esteem and love. It is true that you have mistaken some of my expressions; others (forgive me for saying it) you seem to me to have misjudged. But in respect of others, I am well aware that my views differ strongly from yours; though I believe that I have said nothing in my book which is not in accordance with the teaching of the Bible, or which transcends the limits so liberally allowed by the Church of England for freedom of thought on such subjects. I will now touch, one by one, on the several points to which you have drawn my attention.

I. I have no doubt whatever that the Canonical Books of Scripture *do* contain errors, and some very grave ones, in *matters of fact*, and that the historical narratives are *not* to be depended on as true in all their details. I have never stated this publicly; but surely, in this age of critical inquiry, every intelligent student of the Scriptures must be aware of the truth of what I say. It is vain to deny what is patent to any careful and conscientious reader, who will set himself to compare one passage of Scripture history with another. And, I must say, I had supposed that there were very few in the present day, except in a very narrow school of theology, who would contest this point.

For instance, Joseph was thirty years old when he "stood before Pharaoh" (Gen. xli. 36), at which time, therefore, Judah was thirty-four; since Jacob married Leah and Rachel after he had been *seven* years with Laban (xxix. 20, 21), and Judah was his *fourth* son by Leah, and Joseph was born when he had been *fourteen* years with Laban (xxx. 25, 26; xxxi. 41), and therefore Judah could not have been more than *four* years older than Joseph. Now the time that Joseph "stood before Pharaoh," *nine* years elapsed, seven of plenty, two of famine, before Jacob went down to

Egypt (xlv. 6); when Judah, therefore, must have been forty-three years old. But (xlvi. 12) we find that Judah's sons, Pharez and Zarah, and the sons of Pharez, Hezron and Hamul, were among the seventy souls who went down to Egypt with Jacob; and Gen. xxxviii. gives us the full account of the birth of Pharez and Zarah. From this it appears that Judah grew up to maturity, took a wife, had three sons by her *in succession*, and each of these grew up to maturity, *after* which Judah's transaction with Tamar took place, and she had by him these two sons, Pharez and Zarah, and Pharez grew to maturity, and had two children—and all this before Judah was forty-three years old! In that time he might have become twice over a grandfather! I need hardly observe that this unquestionable "error in matter of fact" is the more important, inasmuch as the names of Pharez and Hezron occur in the genealogy of Matt. i.

So again, in the New Testament, it is impossible that Matt. iii. 17, and Mark i. 11, or that Matt. xxvi. 46, and Mark xv. 34, should both be strictly true. In Mark x. 46, the blind man is healed, as our Lord was *going out* of Jericho; in Luke xviii. 35, as He was *entering into* Jericho.

Of course, the above are only a few instances, such as occur to me on the moment, of a multitude of others, which may be found in the Scriptures. And they are not mere *discrepancies* (such as that *one* blind man is named in one place, and *two* in another), which may admit of explanation, but absolute contradictions in matters of fact, to deny the existence of which would, for me at all events, be dishonest and immoral, and most unworthy, as it seems to me, of any one who really values the *general* historical truth of the Scriptures.

But I have nowhere said what you have assumed for me in addition to the above, namely,—that "inspiration apparently is exhibited not in the declaration of *the very truth*, which God has revealed to our faith respecting Himself and the way of salvation by Christ, *but* in the spirit and the life which breathes throughout the Holy Book," etc. I say that "the very truth" *is* "the spirit and the life," and not the mere words in which that truth may be conveyed to us.

With respect to the latter portion of your remarks on this subject, I prefer using the language of the Consecration Service, namely,—that I am persuaded that the Holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all doctrine required of necessity for eternal salvation, which is identical with that of the 6th Article; so that both together express sufficiently the mind of our Church. In this sense, of course, I *do* receive the Holy Scriptures as the "rule of faith." But I object to bind myself to such expressions as yours, which are neither in the Bible nor the Prayer-book, and may easily have a meaning given to them very different from what either you or I intend by them. It would be easy, for instance, for me to say that I believe the Bible to "contain the unerring word of God's revealed truth." The question, then, would be, What is meant by God's revealed truth?" Is it "the spirit and life," or the mere words of the Bible? And if the latter, as I understand you to say, then are *all* the words of the Bible part of God's revealed truth; for instance, the story of the birth of Pharez and Hezron, above referred

to? You once told me, I think, that you held the genealogies in Chronicles to be the "Word of God," and, therefore, I supposed are inspired, "unerring word of God's revealed truth." Now I cannot believe this. I imagine those tables to be mere transcripts of family registers, perhaps not even that: and I *know* them to be full of errors and contradictions, which are not in any way to be accounted for by mistakes in the transcription of manuscripts.

So, too, when you say that the dogmatic teaching of the Bible must be received by all Christians, of course I can assent to this. But then I believe that the dogmatic teaching of S. Paul in the Romans is just what I have set forth in my book; and you judge differently.

I certainly do say, and will maintain, that to the man himself there is but one lawgiver—the law within the heart—to which, in some form or other, he must bring every question of morals or of faith for judgment. One man has fully persuaded himself that the letter of the Bible is the revealed Word of God. When his reason is satisfied of this, his conscience tells him that at all cost of bodily or mental pain he must hold to the letter of the Bible. Another's conscience keeps him, in like manner, subject implicitly to the dicta of his Church, when his reason is once satisfied that the Church has a right to command him. And each of these will test his conduct continually, by bringing it into comparison with the words of the Bible or the Church, before the tribunal of his conscience. If his heart does not condemn him in this review, he will be satisfied, and "have confidence before God," though all the while his conscience may really be injured by slavery to a defective judgment of his reasoning powers. Another takes a different view of inspiration, as I do myself, and believe that God's Spirit is indeed speaking in the Bible to all who will humbly seek and listen to His teaching, but that, even when we read the different portions of it, we are to "try the spirits, whether they are of God, to prove all things, and hold fast that which is good," to "compare spiritual things with spiritual,"—that is a part of our glorious, yet solemn, responsibility to do this,—that, having the Spirit ourselves, "an unction from the Holy One, that we may have all things," having the promise that we shall be "guided into all truth" if we seek daily to have our minds enlightened and our consciences quickened, by walking in the Light already vouchsafed to us, we are not at liberty to shake off this responsibility of judging for ourselves whether this or that portion of the Bible has a message from God to our souls or not; God will not relieve us from this responsibility; He will not give us what, in one form or other, men are so prone to desire—an infallible external guide—a voice from without, such as men often wish to substitute for the voice within.

II. On the second point to which you refer, I believe that my language is entirely in accordance with the Second and Ninth Articles of our Church; and I must say that I am surprised that you should have remarked as you have done on this subject, when I have written in my book as follows:

Page 65. "With this knowledge of our sinful state, and without the

Gospel, we should indeed be bound down under a weight of woe, under the consciousness of a heavy burden, helplessly aware of our coming doom, and even now feeling it beforehand. Having thus the certainty of the curse upon us, being, indeed, under it already," etc.

Page 67. "Our death is *no longer* a token of the curse lying heavily upon us."

Page 68. "Through that precious bloodshedding the whole race has been redeemed from the curse."

Page 97. "We shall die—*no longer*, as incurring a part of the curse of our fallen nature."

Page 106. "The curse of their sinful nature has been taken away." "By their natural birth they feel at once as fallen, sinful creatures under a condemnation of death."

Page 112. "The cloud of guilty fear has been removed, which must otherwise have hung, by reason of the sin in our nature, between our souls and the blessed face of God."

But, indeed, there are innumerable passages, in which my book distinctly implies and expresses the belief that Christ suffered as a sacrifice for *original* guilt, as well as for actual sins of men.

III. With regard to the Atonement, I believe of course that I have expressed the mind of S. Paul upon this point. I most assuredly do *not* "deny that our Lord was a true propitiatory sacrifice for our sins," as you say; for I have distinctly said (p. 68) that "we are privileged to look at Christ Jesus, through faith in His Blood, and behold in Him the propitiation for our sins, the object which makes us acceptable to God." I have no less distinctly expressed my belief that "we have redemption through His Blood, even the forgiveness of sins;" for I have said (page 69) through that precious bloodshedding the whole race has been redeemed from the curse." And I am sure that there are other passages where, in other like words, I have said the same.

But I do deny that His was a *vicarious* sacrifice, in the sense in which I understand you to use the word, namely, that He endured in our stead the weight of God's wrath. He bore the penalty due to our sins. I believe that neither the expression nor the idea is scriptural; nor is either to be found in the Prayer-book. In the New Testament it is *invariably* said that our Lord suffered or died *hyper*, on behalf of, not *anti*, instead of, the children of men—the same expression being used as when the shepherd is said to lay down his life *for*, not instead of, the sheep, or where S. Peter says "he will lay down his life *for* his Lord, or where S. Paul says "he is ready, not only to be bound, but also to die, *for* the name of the Lord Jesus." There are passages without number where the preposition *hyper* is used of our Lord's suffering or dying for us, in several of which some manuscripts read *peri*, on account of, but not one of them, reads *anti*, instead of, in place of. Nor is there one single instance in the whole New Testament where the word *antilutron* is used in this connection. The only approach to it is in the use of the expression *anti pollon*, which occurs in Matt. xx. 28, Mark x. 45, where, however, nothing is

implied about enduring God's wrath in our stead, as if He ransomed us out of God's hand; and nothing more is said than I have said myself in page 97, "Now that he, our Head, has paid that debt, we are free;" and in page 110, "We have paid this debt to Sin, the tyrant [which was needed that we might be ransomed from his power], because he has paid it;" and on page 111, "He paid a sufficient debt to Sin, the tyrant, to release us from any further necessity of dying." And so S. Paul, having used a similar expression in 1 Tim. ii. 6, *ho dous heauton antilutron hyper panton* explains his meaning in Tit. ii. 14, to be—not He ransomed them from the hand of God, but He ransomed them from the possession and power of evil, *hos edoken heauton hyper hemon hina lutrosetai hemas apo pases anomias.* I repeat the assertion, there is not a single expression in the whole New Testament which distinctly implies that Christ suffered the weight of His Father's wrath in our stead. If there be, surely it can be produced. The single passage you quote—that He bore our sins in His own body on the tree—does not prove it. If, indeed, the doctrine of vicarious suffering of God's wrath in our stead were distinctly taught in other passages of the New Testament, these words of S. Peter might be explained to have this meaning. But in themselves they do not express it. He "bore our sins," not the penalty due to our sins. And in the same chapter of Isaiah to which S. Peter refers, we read "He bore our sorrows, and carried our sicknesses," which words S. Matthew quotes (viii. 17), just after our Lord had healed many sick persons, to express (as I understand it) His sympathising and sharing in all the sorrows and woes of fallen humanity. In the same sense I understand the words "He bore our sins." For our sakes He took the likeness of sinful flesh, He was made sin, He suffered and died as a sinner. He bore our sins, as He bore our sorrows, His whole life of obedience culminating in the death upon the cross. But there is not a word here of His bearing the weight of God's anger in our stead.

When you say that my language is not always consistent with itself, that it is in some places more evangelical than others, I must respectfully contest this, and assert that my language is the same throughout, as evangelical in one place as another, though it is not possible on every page to produce all that one would say upon the great subject concerned, especially when the thoughts of the commentator must follow those of the original writer. How it can be said that I maintain that our Lord came to "release us only from the power and dominion, not from the guilt of our sins," with such passages as I have written, not only on the pages you have quoted (68, 94, 95, 161, 162), but in many others where the subject led to it, I cannot conceive, as *e.g.* page 65, "With this knowledge of our sinful state, and without the Gospel, we should be bound down under a weight of woe, helplessly aware of our *coming doom*, having the certainty of the curse upon us;" or page iii. "The cloud of *guilty fear* has been removed, which must otherwise have hung, by reason of the sin in our nature, between our souls and the face of God." You ask me how I can reconcile my teaching with the plain declaration of the 2nd Article, which

declares that "Christ truly suffered to *reconcile His Father to us*, and to be a *sacrifice*, not only for original guilt, but for the *actual sins* of men." I answer that, as to the latter portion of this Article, I have repeatedly asserted it in my book: only I see nothing in this Article about a *vicarious* sacrifice, and I have taught that it was a *propitiatory* sacrifice—thus He came to offer, in His life and death of perfect obedience, a propitiatory sacrifice on our behalf, well pleasing and acceptable unto God, so that the Father looks upon the Son, is satisfied in Him, and with us in Him. My whole book teaches, in the words of the 31st Article, that "the offering of Christ, once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone"

As to the former portion of the 2nd Article, I am sorry that the expression is there used, "to reconcile the Father to us," because it is not scriptural, and it is liable to be misinterpreted. But these words of our Church cannot be meant to contradict or set aside the Apostle's own words, when he says that "all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to Himself by Jesus Christ," that "God was in Christ, *reconciling the world unto Himself*, not imputing their trespasses unto them." There is, of course, a sense in which a father displeased requires to be reconciled to his child, though tenderly loving him all the while that he corrects him and manifests his anger towards him. I have thought that our Lord came, at His Father's own command, to reconcile His Father and our Father in this sense to us; and I have used the expression on page 89, "one reconciled or, rather, reconciling Father and Friend."

IV. The Scripture teaches us that "God is love." Being perfect love, He *must* be perfectly holy, just, and righteous. And surely my book in a hundred places speaks as strongly of God's loving correction of the wilful and disobedient as of His loving delight in the faithful and true. It cannot, I say it confidently, be justly laid to my charge that I overlook the holiness and justice and righteousness of God, though certainly I do not hold the dogma that God cannot forgive sin, even in an infant, without taking vengeance for it, without inflicting on some one pain and bitter anguish as a penalty.

I do hold that *all* men are justified before God, using the word in the sense in which S. Paul uses it throughout this epistle, not in that which modern theologians may perhaps assign to it. I do *not* hold that our justification depends on our faith, because that would make it a matter of works, in direct opposition to S. Paul's teaching. Our *salvation* is a totally different thing from our justification. Being justified, we are to "work out our salvation," and, therefore, for this we must have faith.

But with S. Paul the word "salvation" means something very different from the miserable notion commonly attached to the word, of mere deliverance from the pit of woe. He means by it the being saved from that divine displeasure which is declared against all wilful unfaithfulness, and which will be manifested upon us Christians above all others, if we do not live according to the light vouchsafed to us, and answer to the

gracious end to which we have been called. To "work out our salvation" means, with S. Paul, to live faithfully as becomes the children of God, who are privileged to know that they are justified and brought near to their Father's footstool, and being prepared here on earth for His glory. It is to be labouring daily with the grace already given to cast off the works of darkness, and put on more and more of the armour of light, and so not incur the displeasure of our Lord, as slothful or unfaithful servants, and require His angry chastisements. This is what he means by "working out our salvation," and being "saved from wrath," that wrath which is declared, not against the guilt of our fallen nature, or the sins of impurity and ignorance, in respect of all which "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself," but against all who sin wilfully, whether by actual transgressions or slothful negligence, who "keep back the truth," which they know, "in unrighteousness."

I do not agree with your statement of my ideas about faith, viz. that "what faith does for us is to make known to us, to give us a conscious assurance of what would be equally true, whether we have it or not, that God looks upon us as righteous in His Son." I do not think that faith *does* this for us: it is the "conscious assurance" of something which in itself is true, whether we believe it or not, the realising of things hoped for, the conviction of things unseen. The words, however, which you have quoted from page 12 I entirely abide by: I am certain that this is what S. Paul intends to teach in this epistle.

I think you have not rightly read what I have said on page 74. I have not said, as you appear to think, that "justification *consists* in being justified in one's own conscience." Quite the contrary. I hold that we are justified in *God's sight*, whether we know or believe it, or not. But I said that in the particular passage then under consideration, and in some other places, "both here and elsewhere," not, generally, everywhere. S. Paul is using the word justified with reference especially to those who, like Abraham, were privileged to *know* that they were justified—had had brought home to them consciously this gift of righteousness, though really justified already in God's sight, as he was.

But when, after quoting this and other passages, you go on to say, "If these views are true, I cannot see why we need to preach the Gospel to the heathen; it seems to me that you take away the great motive for doing so; they are, without our teaching, accepted, righteous, justified, *saved.*" I really hardly know how to reply to this—not because I cannot reply to it, but (pardon me for saying so) because I am amazed that it should be necessary to make a reply to it.

In the first place, I have taught that neither they nor we shall be "saved," if we die in impenitence, each according to the light he has received. But it is plain that you are speaking only of *endless* horror in the pit of woe, whereas I am thinking of that Divine displeasure which every human being will incur who lives unfaithfully in proportion to the light he has received, and dies in impenitence. I have said accordingly (page 95), "We shall be saved from that wrath by having our faults freely pardoned

for His sake *when confessed and repented of.* In what way that anger will take effect on the impenitent in the eternal world, God only knows ; but we have the figures of it in the eternal doom and fire, and the outer darkness."

But have we no motive to preach such a Gospel as S. Paul's, according to my views of it, to the heathen ? To tell them that God loves them, that He, after whom they have been groping in the darkness, has been caring for them all along, and now calls them near to Himself, that they may know Him more fully and the rich treasures of His love ! Why, this is the very life and soul of missionary work. It has been my joy for seven years past thus to publish the Gospel of the grace of God ; and, if you could witness the effect upon those who heard the message you would not doubt that it was at least as effective as that Gospel, " which is not a Gospel," which is so often preached to them. Is the Gospel, then, only a means for " saving " men's souls from endless misery ? And because they, who are faithful with their fraction of a talent without it, may be as *safe* as, that is, not more or less *safe* than, Christians with their ten thousand talents, is there no work to be done among the heathen that the hearts of our fellow-men may be gladdened and their eyes enlightened, and their spirits filled with life, and, above all, that God's gracious command may be obeyed, and His Name be glorified ?

I do believe that my teaching on this subject in this book is " in full accordance with the plain teaching of the Church which I am pledged to guard and maintain, as laid down in her Articles," and above all, with my consecration vow.

V. You have been long aware that I do not agree with those who hold what is called the " Sacramental System," and that I regard their views as unsound and unscriptural. But I have *not* spoken of the sacraments as *only* signs, and not also " means of grace," when duly received. Here also I cannot admit that my language is at all inconsistent with itself. It is perfectly consistent from my own point of view. Of course, we *have* a right—every human being has, if he only knew it, and even a heathen may know it in a measure, and exercise it—to call upon the " Faithful Creator " as our Father and Friend. (Does not S. Paul allow this, when he quotes a heathen poet's words as true, " We are His offspring " ?) But in baptism we have that right declared and assured to us in the most gracious manner ; we are then taken formally into the family of God ; we are made children in a higher sense of the word.

I have said that the " inward and spiritual grace," or free gift in baptism, is " something that is given us in Christ [viz : our dying to sin and rising to new life, by virtue of our union with Him in His death and resurrection life], which is *set forth* to us in the sacrament,—of which we are partakers, which is bestowed freely upon us and upon all mankind, and depends not in any way on the spirit in which we come or are brought to the sacrament." And you remark, " Surely, this is to speak of it as a bare sign, not as the means of conveying any gift or blessing to us." But this inference is quite unnecessary. The free gift of God is set forth to us in either sacrament : it is for us to embrace it, as far as we are able, by a true living faith.

It is true that, as to the "free gift" of God, which is set forth to us in the sacrament of baptism, I have taught that we all share, through God's goodness, from our very birth-hour, without our own co-operation, in the benefit of having "died to Sin," as a tyrant that has any right to hold us in his grasp, and being made "alive unto God" by virtue of our union with the Great Head of our race. To *infants*, then, the sacrament, as the 27th Article teaches, is but the instrument by which they are grafted into God's inner family, the Church, and by which His promises and their adoption to be His children are visibly signed and sealed to them. Whereas to *adults*, coming in the right spirit, it is a means of "confirming faith," already existing, and "increasing grace," of which they are already partaking, not by virtue of any mysterious efficacy of the sacrament itself, as such, but, "by virtue of prayer to God."

With respect also to the Lord's Supper, I have taught in this book, and more fully in my "Sermons on the Eucharist," that we are all partakers in like manner, from our birth-hour, of the benefits flowing from the body and blood of Christ, which is the "free gift" of God, set forth to us in that sacrament. But this sacrament, as the Church Catechism teaches, is ordained for the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, and of the benefits which we receive thereby; and coming to it faithfully, we shall be privileged to draw continually by it, as a means of grace, more and more life from the Fountain of Life.

Having my book on the Romans before you, and having so recently had occasion to read with some attention my "Sermons on the Eucharist," I cannot conceive how you can find any just reason for quoting against me the words of Articles xxv. xxviii. and xxix., the Communion Service, Homilies and Catechism, with which, as I believe the views which I have expressed in these publications as to the nature of the two sacraments are in entire accordance. I cannot say the same of the "Sacramental System," which I believe to be opposed to the Prayer-book. You say that these Articles, etc., "include my saying that all men are partaking everywhere, at all times, of Christ's body and blood, whether in the sacraments or out of them, whether they feed upon them by living faith or not." I have shown more fully in my "Sermons on the Eucharist" my grounds for making this assertion, viz. that all men have life, spiritual as well as bodily, that they could have no life (as our Lord tells us) without "eating His flesh and drinking His blood,"—that, consequently, they do partake of His body and blood, and so (as Waterland says) "our Lord's *general doctrine in John* vi. seems to abstract from all particulars, and to resolve into this, that whether *with faith or without*, whether *in the sacraments or out of the sacraments*, whether before Christ or since, whether in covenant or out of the covenant, whether here or hereafter, no man ever was, is, or will be accepted, but in and through the grand propitiation made by the blood of Christ." I know that you do not agree in this view, but I am at least not singular in holding it.

VI. I must confess that it does appear to me that you are finding grounds of objection in my book which do not really exist, when you say

that my language on the judgment "leaves you in doubt whether I believe that God has *appointed a day* in which He will judge the world in righteousness: and this, notwithstanding that I have written thus: Page 48, "Whenever Christ shall appear, to visit and judge in His Father's Name, now amidst the affairs of daily life, as well as on *the great day of future account.*" "The gift of righteousness is being continually renewed to such as these, by the free forgiveness of sin in this life, as well as finally declared on the *great day of account.*"

"They often had occasion, as the Apostle had here, to recall the thoughts of men to the fact, that . . . . *the day* would surely come when a righteous Governor would judge the secrets of men." "The new message of the Gospel is that this judgment shall be conducted by Jesus Christ."

Page 75. "All will be judged alike by the same righteous rule, according to their works, and according to the light vouchsafed to them, *in that day when God shall judge the secrets of men by the Lord Jesus Christ.*"

I dare say that there are other passages of a like nature. But I must say, with all deference, that this is not the only suggestion made without the shadow of a ground for it, except it would seem a presentiment, or prejudgment, that so it must be, which has surprised me in your letter.

VII. With regard to the eternal world, I have expressly refused to carry out any scheme to its full and logical conclusions. I have *maintained* no points at all upon the subject, but that He whose Name is Love will deal according to His Name with His creatures. I have said that I entertain "hidden hope"—and I say not even that—for all; and I am very far indeed from saying that the great majority of mankind will be "saved" from God's wrath, because they are all "justified;" though I dare not assert that such wrath will certainly take effect in inflicting endless, unutterable woe; and I have shown abundant reason, as I think, for checking the utterance of that fearful dogma, which so many profess to hold (though they never boldly teach it, and follow it to its consequences), without any authority from the Bible or the Church for holding it—I mean, that the wicked shall not only go into everlasting fire (as I have taught), but shall *remain there in helpless torment for ever and ever.* You would have stated my views upon this subject more correctly if you had written thus: "You maintain these points—that the doctrine of *endless* (not eternal) punishment of the wicked is not found in the Bible or the Prayer-book—that all punishment is an act of love, and *may* be remedial—that our training and discipline *may* not end here, but may extend to the next world, and, for aught we know, to infinite other worlds beyond it—that our chastisement *may* be purifying, that sin may be purged out from God's universe in some way of God's wisdom—that, however, there is no *purgatory*, where penalties are *measured by time and intensity*, and can be remitted by favour or importunity. [What wise and loving earthly parent would remit a punishment until he had reason to believe that it had done its work upon his child?] I am sorry that you do not yourself see an essential difference between my view and the Romish doctrine of purgatory.

Such a difference, however, there is, as I have shown above, and in page 244 of my book.

I do not believe that my doctrine contradicts at all the language of Holy Scripture, or the formularies of our Church, including the Athanasian Creed, when perfectly interpreted. Further, in that Creed, the damnatory clauses are not set forth as any portion of the Catholic Faith. And I understand the language of the 8th Article, namely, that the Creeds can be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture, to apply that *faith* to the doctrine, which is to be *believed* about the Divine nature, rather than to the sanction with which such a belief is enforced.

I am sorry that you have so much misjudged what I have written about the Athanasian Creed as to suggest that I did not hold the essential parts of it, more especially the doctrine of the Divinity of our Lord, than which, from the first moment of my ministry up to the present hour, in all my preaching and teaching (as any one who knows them well must witness), no doctrine of the Church has been maintained by me more strenuously, though I have taught also the doctrine of His perfect humanity more fully and prominently than many, and not lost sight of it practically to a great extent as some do. I say this to you, as a dear friend and brother, though, after all that I have written, even in this book on the Romans, I feel that I should be justified in declining to say it to you as Metropolitan. Nor do I think that you had any just ground from anything that I have said, or omitted to say, in my Commentary, for the remarks which you have made on this point, as on some others.

As to the Athanasian Creed, it is notoriously a stumbling-block to thousands of pious souls, not in the least degree because of the doctrines set forth in the statement of the "Catholic Faith," but because of the harsh language of the damnatory clauses. It is very noticeable that in the oldest manuscript of the oldest commentary (by Fortunatus) on this Creed (preserved at Oxford) the particular clause which you have quoted, the second verse, is left out altogether in Waterland. Do you yourself really believe in the sentence of sweeping condemnation contained in this verse, as *ordinarily* interpreted, in the most *obvious* and *natural* sense of the words? Have you not also reservations of your own, though not, perhaps, as extensive as mine, by which you would except innumerable cases from the judgment here pronounced, which at first sight would seem to be included in one general doom of endless, irremediable woe? I am sure that nine clergymen out of ten have, and, at all events, that they will not dare to take this sentence of the Creed into the pulpit, and preach the doctrine which its words, taken in their most simple and natural sense, obviously contain.

With respect to Rom. ix. 5, it is strange that one of the first advocates for the view which I have taken was Erasmus, no contemptible Greek scholar, I believe, and the first objector to it was Socinus himself. Whatever may be the faults of Professor Jowett, yet as Regius Professor of Greek, he must be allowed to have some voice in a grammatical question of this kind, and he is with me in adopting Lachmann's reading. I have

little doubt that this is the true view of the Apostle's meaning. The explanation which I have given of the connection in which the words stand accounts fully, to my own judgment, for the participle and the position of the adjective, and the whole sentence expresses in fewer words the utterance of Job: "The Lord gave and the Lord hath taken away," *eie to onoma Kuriou eulogeme non*, just as well as S. Paul says, *ho on epi panton, theos, eulogetus eis touse ionas*, "He who is over all, who orders all, is God, blessed for ever!" The translation I have given in the book is grammatical, but I prefer now the above *theos* without the article, as in Heb. iii. 4.

That God may guide us both in the path of duty, and teach us to buy the truth, at all cost, is the fervent prayer of,

My dear Brother,

Yours ever affectionately,

J. W. NATAL.

P.S.—I was ordained deacon and priest by the late Bishop of Ely, who required candidates for holy orders to pay special attention to the "Lectures in Divinity" of Dr. Hey, formerly Norrisian Professor of Divinity for many years at Cambridge. Upon my consecration to the See of Natal, I received a present of books from the University, printed at the University Press, among which are "Hey's Lectures in Divinity, two volumes," which has been recently reprinted, and is still considered, therefore, to be a standard book. A great portion of the work is occupied with the Articles; and, turning to one or two of them, I find a strange resemblance between his language and some parts of my teaching, to which you have so strongly objected.

Thus, on the eternal world and the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed, he writes as follows, vol. i. page 47: "The meaning (of these clauses) is, whoever accepts a message really sent from Heaven must find some benefit from it; whoever rejects such message must at least suffer the *loss of that benefit;* but he may, moreover, have positive punishment inflicted upon him, because of his rejecting what God gave him sufficient opportunity to accept."

Page 49. "Being saved, and being damned or condemned, do not imply any one fixed degree of happiness or misery; but admit of various degrees without limit. . . . Nor is any great degree necessarily implied in the word 'everlasting,' taken singly. Indeed, every *fine* [that is, as the former quotation shows, every loss of blessing], however small, is an everlasting punishment. (Comp. my book, page 184. "As we certainly do," etc.)

Page 50. "It may possibly happen that a man may disbelieve and reject the truth itself, and yet not be condemned to any great positive evil, if God knows that his disbelief is owing to some extraordinary want of means of information."

Page 52. "The word 'punish' admits of degrees, as well as 'saved' and 'damned.' [If so, Dr. Hey admits all that I have said; for there can be no degrees in the horror of utter, irremediable loss of all hope of ever seeing one ray of the glory and goodness of God.] It is probably used either as an equivalent to damned, or as being somewhat *less harsh*."

Page 53. "Though any man may say I must be careful how I reject *truth*, because if I do I shall suffer; though any minister has authority to say, you must be very careful how you reject *truth:* yet no man ought to make himself unhappy, as if he must, of course, be damned for misbelieving the tenets of a certain *creed*."

I hope I may now conclude that a mind not tinctured with superstition or religous fear will be able to supply such *rational limitations* to the *general threatenings* of our Creed, as to judge them harmless in all situations and useful in many—that their tendency is, when terror does not discompose the judgment, to make men *prove* all things, "and *not to accept even the doctrines of the Creed itself implicitly*, lest in accepting anything erroneous they should eventually reject the truth."

As regards the atonement, Dr. Hey sums up his statement of the doctrine in one short proposition, namely (page 187), "God will make sincere Christians eternally happy, notwithstanding some imperfections of theirs, on account of the *merits*, the sufferings, and the death of Christ."

From page 183, taken in connection with the above, it is clear that he does not hold the suffering of our Lord as *vicarious*, in your sense of the word.

"A person may prevent the punishment of another, even by suffering, and yet that suffering not be vicarious. Suppose that a deserter's brother had, by getting maimed and receiving wounds, never perfectly curable, saved a citadel or the life of a commander, and was to solicit for a remission of the deserter's punishment, urging that he wanted no gold or silver for his past services, but only that his brother should that once escape pain. If his petition was granted, he would relieve another, and in a good measure by his sufferings, but yet he could not be said to suffer vicarious evil or punishment; his brother's escape might be conceived as owing to his *merits*, or to be given to him as a reward."

Page 184. "A term much in use in discussions about the Atonement is *satisfaction*. It seems sometimes to mislead. . . . The doctrine of satisfaction implies that God *must* execute justice, so we call inflicting punishment. . . . . Justice is a good quality, therefore a perfect Deity has it for an attribute; therefore, the offender *must* be *punished*. No resource? Why, yes, a corporal punishment may be changed into a *fine*, or A may bear the fine which B has incurred. Why not even a personal punishment? Whichever is punished, the heinousness of the crime is published, and the terrors of justice displayed. In short, a man may be punished by substitute, and then justice will be *satisfied; satisfaction* will be made: there will be an 'atonement' to appease the divine wrath. Thus are men's thoughts apt to run on; and thus is the doctrine of *satisfaction* established. But I think

some expressions in the train are taken as meaning more than they do mean," etc.

Page 186. "The notion of satisfaction, the notion of satisfying divine justice, conceived to be under the necessity of punishing rigorously the sins of mankind, brings in what appears to me a still more difficult doctrine,—I mean that of imputation of sin to Christ. . . . It is a something wholly inconceivable, and only spoken of in order to keep the *theory of satisfying divine justice* entire and compact; though, as far as I can judge, that theory which cannot be supported without terms out of which all meaning must be thrown, should answer some *useful* purpose." He adds in a note, "If all this is to support our popular notion of *satisfaction*, it might as well be set aside."

Page 187. "The Christian is always to consider God, not as acting arbitrarily, but as the rewarder of virtue and the punisher of evil, in which character it pleases His Infinite Wisdom and Goodness to give the inestimable privilege to Christians in a manner perfectly *gratuitous* with *some view to the sufferings, the conduct, the merits of His Son.*"

Appendix VII.—Vol. II. p. 105.

In the Name of God, Amen.

We, Robert, by Divine permission Bishop of Cape Town and Metropolitan, do hereby make known that,—

Whereas the Bishop of the See of Natal is declared in the Letters-Patent issued to us, under Her Majesty's sign-manual, on the 8th day of December, 1853, to be subject and subordinate to the See of Cape Town, and to the Bishop thereof, in the same manner as any Bishop and See in the Province of Canterbury is under the authority of the Archiepiscopal See of that Province, and the Archbishop of the same:

And whereas, further, it is provided in the said Letters-Patent that in case any proceedings should be instituted against the said Bishop of Natal, such proceeding should originate and be carried on before us; and whereas we are, by the same Letters-Patent, directed and authorised to take cognisance of such proceedings:

And whereas at the time of the appointment and consecration of the Right Reverend John William Colenso, the Bishop of Natal, the said Bishop of Natal did voluntarily recognise and submit himself to the provisions of the said Letters-Patent, and did accept the said office of Bishop of Natal under the said provisions, and did then solemnly profess and promise all due reverence and obedience to the Metropolitan Bishop of Cape Town, and to his successors, and did thereafter, in due accordance with such promise and profession, continue to submit himself to our jurisdiction as such Metropolitan, and from the said promise and profession hath never been relieved:

And whereas, on the 12th day of May last, the Very Rev. the Dean of Cape Town, the Venerable the Archdeacon of Graham's Town, and the Venerable the Archdeacon of George, did lay before us, as such Metropolitan, in writing, certain charges against the said Right Rev. John William Colenso,—firstly, of having promulgated opinions which contravene and subvert the Catholic faith as defined and expressed in the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, and the Formularies of the Book of Common Prayer of the United Church of England and Ireland; and, secondly, of having depraved, impugned, and otherwise brought into disrepute the Book of Common Prayer, particularly portions of the Ordinal and Baptismal Services, and of having thus violated the law of the United Church of England and Ireland, as contained in the 36th of the Canons and Constitutions Ecclesiastical; and the said Dean and Archdeacons did then declare themselves ready to prove the said charges, and to claim our judgment thereon:

And whereas we did, thereafter, on the 18th of May last, cause the said Bishop of Natal be cited to appear before us on the 17th day of November following, in the Cathedral Church of Cape Town, to answer the said charges:

And whereas, on the said 17th day of November, we did, as such Metropolitan aforesaid, hold a Court in the said Cathedral Church, having previously invited certain of the Bishops of this Province to be present as Assessors, and the Bishops of Graham's Town and of the Orange Free State being then present with us, as such Assessors:

And whereas on the said 17th day of November the said Bishop of Natal appeared by his agent, and did then, as well by his said agent as also in a letter addressed to us, admit the service of the said citation upon him, and his knowledge of the charges he was called upon to answer; and did further, in answer to the said charges—firstly, offer a protest against our jurisdiction; secondly, did submit certain matters of defence to the said charges; and thirdly, did intimate to us his intention of appealing if we should proceed to the delivery of a judgment, and such judgment should be adverse to him:

And whereas we did then refuse to regard the said protest, and did proceed to the hearing of the charges brought as aforesaid:

And whereas the aforesaid Dean and Archdeacons did then, in open Court, submit to our judgment certain extracts from two works, alleged to have been written and published by the said Bishop of Natal,—to wit: "S. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, newly translated and explained from a Missionary Point of View," and Parts I. and II. of the "Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua critically examined;" copies of which extracts had been before served upon the said Bishop of Natal, with the citation aforesaid, and of which extracts other copies are hereunto annexed, and herewith recorded.

And whereas, after hearing the said Dean and Archdeacons, and duly considering the matters of defence submitted as aforesaid, and after due consultation with the said Bishops of Graham's Town and the Orange Free State, present with us as Assessors, we have found it sufficiently proved

that certain of the said extracts, to wit, those of them arranged under the heads of the Schedule I. to Schedule VIII., do contain opinions, as charged, which contravene and subvert the Catholic Faith, as defined and expressed in the thirty-nine Articles of Religion and the Formularies of the Book of Common Prayer of the United Church of England and Ireland ; and certain other extracts, to wit, those arranged under Schedule IX., do, in substance, deprave, impugn, and bring into disrepute the Book of Common Prayer :

And whereas it was further duly proved that the works from which the said extracts have been taken were published both in this Province and elsewhere, with the knowledge and by the authority and consent of the said Bishop of Natal :

Now therefore, we, in the exercise of our jurisdiction aforesaid, do hereby sentence, adjudge, and decree the said Bishop of Natal to be deposed from the said office as such Bishop, and to be further prohibited from the exercise of any divine office within any part of the Metropolitical Province of Cape Town.

But inasmuch as the said Bishop of Natal is not personally present, and we desire to afford him sufficient opportunity of retracting and recalling the extracts aforesaid, before this sentence shall take effect, we do suspend the operation of the said sentence, for the purpose of such retractation, until the 16th day of April next ; and we hereby decree and order, that if on or before the 4th day of March next the said Bishop of Natal shall have filed of record with Douglas Dubois, of Doctor's Commons, in the city of London, proctor, solicitor, and notary public, our commissary in England, at his office, 7 Godliman Street, Doctors' Commons, London, a full, unconditional, and absolute retractation, in writing, of all the extracts aforesaid ; or otherwise shall have, before the 16th day of April next, filled with the Registrar of this Diocese, at his office in Cape Town, such full, unconditional, and absolute retractation and recall of the said extracts, then, in either case, on the day of such filing, this sentence shall become null and void ; but if, on the said 16th day of April next, no such retractation shall have been recorded in manner above set forth, then the said sentence shall be of full force and effect, and shall be published, so soon as convenient after the said 16th day of April, in all the Churches of the Diocese of Natal, and in the several Cathedral Churches of the province of Cape Town.

In testimony whereof, we have hereunto caused our Episcopal Seal to be affixed, and do subscribe our hand, in open Court, this Sixteenth day of December, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three, in the Cathedral Church of S. George, and do deliver the same to the Registrar of the Diocese to be duly recorded.

(Signed) R. Capetown (L.S.)

APPENDIX VIII.—Vol. II. p. 191.

JUDGMENT of the LORDS of the JUDICIAL COMMITTEE of the PRIVY COUNCIL upon the Petition of the LORD BISHOP of NATAL, referred to the Judicial Committee by Her Majesty's Order in Council of the 10th June, 1864; delivered 20th March, 1865.

Present—Lord Chancellor; Lord Cranworth; Lord Kingsdown; Dean of the Arches; Master of the Rolls.

The Bishop of Natal and the Bishop of Cape Town (who are the parties to this proceeding) are ecclesiastical Persons who have been created Bishops by the Queen, in the exercise of her authority as Sovereign of this realm and Head of the Established Church.

These Bishops were consecrated under Mandate from the Queen by the Archbishop of Canterbury, in the manner prescribed by the law of England.

They received and hold their dioceses under grants made by the Crown. Their status, therefore, both ecclesiastical and temporal, must be ascertained and defined by the law of England; and it is plain that their legal existence depends on acts which have no validity or effect except on the basis of the supremacy of the Crown.

Further, their respective and relative rights and liabilities must be determined by the principles of English law applied to the construction of the grants to them contained in the Letters-Patent; for they are the creatures of English law, and dependent on that law for their existence, rights, and attributes.

We must treat the parties before us as standing on this foundation, and on no other.

The Letters-Patent by which Dr. Gray was appointed Bishop of Cape Town and also Metropolitan, passed the Great Seal on the 8th December, 1853. These Letters-Patent recited, among other things, that it had "been represented to Her Majesty by the Archbishop of Canterbury that the then existing see or diocese of Cape Town was of inconvenient extent, and that for the due spiritual care and superintendence of the religious interests of the inhabitants thereof, and for the maintenance of the doctrine and discipline of the United Church of England and Ireland within the Colony of the Cape of Good Hope and its dependencies, and the Island of Saint Helena, it was desirable and expedient that the same should be divided into three (or more) distinct and separate sees or dioceses, to be styled the Bishopric of Cape Town, the Bishopric of Graham's Town, and the Bishopric of Natal—the Bishops of the said several sees of Graham's Town and Natal and their successors to be subject and subordinate to the see of Cape Town and to the Bishop thereof and his successors, in the same manner as any bishop of any see within the Province of Canterbury was under the authority of the Archiepiscopal See of that province and the Archbishop of the same;" and the Letters-Patent contained the following passages :—

"And we do further will and ordain that the said Right Reverend Father in God, Robert Gray, Bishop of the said See of Cape Town, and his successors the Bishops thereof for the time being, shall be and be deemed and taken to be the Metropolitan Bishop in our Colony of the Cape of Good Hope and its dependencies, and our Island of Saint Helena, subject nevertheless to the general superintendence and revision of the Archbishop of Canterbury for the time being, and subordinate to the Archiepiscopal See of the Province of Canterbury ; and we will and ordain that the said Bishops of Graham's Town and Natal respectively shall be Suffragan Bishops to the said Bishop of Cape Town and his successors. And we will and grant to the said Bishop of Cape Town and his successors full power and authority, as Metropolitan of the Cape of Good Hope and of the Island of Saint Helena, to perform all functions peculiar and appropriate to the office of Metropolitan within the limits of the said Sees of Graham's Town and Natal, and to exercise *Metropolitan jurisdiction* over the Bishops of the said Sees and their successors, and over all archdeacons, dignitaries, and all other chaplains, ministers, priests, and deacons in holy orders of the United Church of England and Ireland within the limits of the said dioceses. And we do by these presents give and grant unto the said Bishop of Cape Town and his successors full power and authority to visit once in five years, or oftener if occasion shall require, as well the said several Bishops and their successors, as all dignitaries and other chaplains, ministers, priests, and deacons in holy orders of the United Church of England and Ireland resident in the said dioceses, for correcting and supplying the defects of the said Bishops and their successors, with all and all manner of visitorial jurisdiction, power, and coercion.

"And we do hereby authorise and empower the said Bishop of Cape Town and his successors to inhibit during any such visitation of the said dioceses the exercise of all or of such part or parts of the ordinary jurisdiction of the said Bishops or their successors as to him the said Bishop of Cape Town or his successors shall seem expedient, and during the time of such visitation to exercise by himself or themselves, or his or their commissaries, such powers, functions, and jurisdictions in and over the said dioceses as the Bishops thereof might have exercised if they had not been inhibited from exercising the same.

"And we do further ordain and declare that if any person against whom a judgment or decree shall be pronounced by the said Bishops or their successors, or their commissary or commissaries, shall conceive himself to be aggrieved by such sentence, it shall be lawful for such person to appeal to the said Bishop of Cape Town or his successors, provided such appeal be entered within fifteen days after such sentence shall have been pronounced.

"And we do give and grant to the said Bishop of Cape Town and his successors full power and authority finally to decree and determine the said appeals.

"And we do further will and ordain that in case any proceeding shall be instituted against any of the said Bishops of Graham's Town and Natal, when placed under the said Metropolitical See of Cape Town, such pro-

ceedings shall originate and be carried on before the said Bishop of Cape Town, whom we hereby authorise and direct to take cognisance of the same. . . . .

"And if any party shall conceive himself aggrieved by any judgment, decree, or sentence pronounced by the said Bishop of Cape Town or his successors, either in case of such review or in any cause originally instituted before the said Bishop or his successors, it shall be lawful for the said party to appeal to the said Archbishop of Canterbury or his successors, who shall finally decide and determine the said appeal."

The Letters-Patent which constituted the See of Natal and appointed the Appellant to that See, were sealed and bear date on the 23d November, 1853, fifteen days before the grant of the Letters-Patent to the Bishop of Cape Town.

The Letters-Patent creating the See of Natal recited the Patent of September, 1847, which created the original diocese of Cape Town, and appointed Dr. Gray the Bishop thereof, and that he had since resigned the office of Bishop of Cape Town, whereby the said See had become and was then vacant. The Patent also recited that it was expedient and desirable that the said diocese should be divided into three or more distinct and separate dioceses, to be styled the Bishoprics of Cape Town, Graham's Town, and Natal, the Bishops of the said several Sees of Graham's Town and Natal to be subject and subordinate to the See of Cape Town, and the Bishop thereof and his successors, in the same manner as any Bishop of any See within the Province of Canterbury was under the authority of the Archiepiscopal See of that Province and the Archbishop of the same; and the Letters-Patent proceeded to erect, found, make, ordain, and constitute the district of Natal, to be a distinct and separate Bishop's See and Diocese, to be called the Bishopric of Natal. And after appointing Dr. Colenso to be the Bishop of the said See, and granting that the said Bishop of Natal and his successors should be a body corporate, the Letters-Patent contained the following passage:—

"And we do further ordain and declare that the said Bishop of Natal and his successors shall be subject and subordinate to the See of Cape Town, and to the Bishop thereof and his successors, in the same manner as any Bishop of any See within the Province of Canterbury, in our Kingdom of England, is under the authority of the Archiepiscopal See of that Province, and of the Archbishop of the same: and we do hereby further will and ordain that the said John William Colenso, and every Bishop of Natal, shall, within six months after the date of their respective Letters-Patent, take an oath of due obedience to the Bishop of Cape Town for the time being, as his Metropolitan, which oath shall and may be ministered unto him by the said Archbishop, or by any person by him duly appointed or authorised for that purpose."

The Letters-Patent then proceeded to confer on the Bishop of Natal and his successors Episcopal jurisdiction and authority over all rectors, curates, ministers, chaplains, priests, and deacons within the diocese, and directed that, if any party should conceive himself aggrieved by any judg-

ment, decree, or sentence pronounced by the Bishop of Natal or his successors, he should have an appeal to the Bishop of Cape Town, who should finally decide and determine the appeal.

Under these Letters-Patent the Appellant was consecrated on the 30th November, 1853, and he took on oath of canonical obedience to the Metropolitan Bishop of Cape Town, which oath was administered to him by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and was in these words:—"I, John William Colenso, Doctor in Divinity, appointed Bishop of the See and Diocese of Natal, do profess and promise all due reverence and obedience to the Metropolitan Bishop of Cape Town and to his successors, and to the Metropolitan Church of S. George, Cape Town." At this time there was not in reality any Metropolitan See of Cape Town, or any Bishop thereof, in existence.

These several Letters-Patent were not granted, in pursuance of any Orders or Order made by Her Majesty in Council, nor were they made by virtue of any statute of the Imperial Parliament, nor were they confirmed by any Act of the Legislature of the Cape of Good Hope or of the Legislative Council of Natal.

Previously to these Letters-Patent being granted, the District of Natal had been erected into a distinct and separate Government; and, by Letters-Patent granted by the Crown in 1847, it was ordained that it should have a Legislative Council which should have power to make such laws and ordinances as might be required for the peace, order, and good government of the district. With respect to the Cape of Good Hope, by Letters-Patent dated 23rd May, 1850, it was declared and ordained by Her Majesty that there should be within the Settlement of the Cape of Good Hope a Parliament, which should be holden by the Governor, and should consist of the Governor, a Legislative Council, and a House of Assembly, and that such Parliament should have authority to make laws for the peace, welfare, and good government of the settlement.

In the year 1863 certain charges of heresy and false doctrine were preferred against the Appellant before the Bishop of Cape Town as Metropolitan, and, upon these charges, the Bishop of Cape Town, claiming to exercise jurisdiction as Metropolitan, did, on the 16th day of December, 1863, sentence, adjudge, and decree the Appellant, the Bishop of Natal, to be deposed from his office as such Bishop, and to be further prohibited from the exercise of any Divine office within any part of the Metropolitan Province of Cape Town. In pronouncing this Decree, the Bishop of Cape Town claimed to exercise jurisdiction as Metropolitan by virtue of his Letters-Patent, and of the office thereby conferred on him, and as having thereby acquired legal authority to try and condemn the Appellant; and the Appellant protested against such assumption of jurisdiction.

This sentence and Decree of Dr. Gray as Metropolitan has been published and promulgated in the Diocese of Natal, and the Clergy of that Diocese have been thereby prohibited from yielding obedience to the Appellant as Bishop of Natal.

In this state of things three principal questions arise, and have been

argued before us: First, Were the Letters-Patent of the 8th December, 1853, by which Dr. Gray was appointed Metropolitan, and a Metropolitan See or Province was expressed to be created, valid and good in law? Secondly, Supposing the ecclesiastical relation of Metropolitan and Suffragan to have been created, was the grant of coercive authority and jurisdiction expressed by the Letters-Patent to be thereby made to the Metropolitan valid and good in law? Thirdly, Can the oath of canonical obedience taken by the Appellant to the Bishop of Cape Town, and his consent to accept his See as part of the Metropolitan Province of Cape Town, confer any jurisdiction or authority on the Bishop of Cape Town by which this sentence of deprivation of the Bishopric of Natal can be supported?

With respect to the first question, we apprehend it to be clear, upon principle, that after the establishment of an independent Legislature in the Settlements of the Cape of Good Hope and Natal, there was no power in the Crown by virtue of its Prerogative (for these Letters-Patent were not granted under the provisions of any Statute) to establish a Metropolitan See or Province, or to create an Ecclesiastical Corporation, whose status, rights, and authority the Colony could be required to recognise.

After a Colony or Settlement has received legislative institutions, the Crown (subject to the special provisions of any Act of Parliament) stands in the same relation to that Colony or Settlement as it does to the United Kingdom.

It may be true that the Crown as legal Head of the Church has a right to command the consecration of a Bishop, but it has no power to assign him any diocese, or give him any sphere of action within the United Kingdom. The United Church of England and Ireland is not a part of the Constitution in any Colonial Settlement, nor can its authorities or those who bear office in it claim to be recognised by the law of the Colony, otherwise than as the members of a voluntary association.

The course which legislation has taken on this subject is a strong proof of the correctness of these conclusions. In the year 1813 it was deemed expedient to establish a Bishopric in the East Indies (then under the Government of the East India Company), and although the Bishop was appointed and consecrated under the authority of the Crown, yet it was thought necessary to obtain the sanction of the Legislature and that an Act of Parliament should be passed to give the Bishop legal status and authority. Accordingly, by Statute 53 Geo. III. c. 155, sec. 49, it was enacted that in case it should please His Majesty by His Royal Letters-Patent to erect, found, and constitute one Bishopric for the whole of the British territories in the East Indies and parts therein mentioned, a certain salary should be paid to the Bishop by the East India Company; and by the 51st and 52nd sections it was enacted that such Bishop should not have or use any jurisdiction, or exercise any episcopal functions whatsoever but such as should be limited to him by Letters-Patent, and that it should be lawful for his Majesty, by Letters-Patent, to grant to such bishop such ecclesiastical jurisdiction and the exercise of such episcopal functions within the East Indies and parts aforesaid as His Majesty should think necessary

for administering holy ceremonies, and for the superintendence and good government of the ministers of the Church establishment within the East Indies and parts aforesaid. Subsequently, in the year 1833, it was deemed right to found two additional Bishoprics, one at Madras and the other at Bombay, and again an Act of Parliament (3 and 4 Wm. IV. c. 86) was passed, by the 93rd section of which it was enacted in like manner that the Crown should have power to grant to such Bishops within their dioceses ecclesiastical jurisdiction; and it was also enacted and declared that the Bishop of Calcutta should be Metropolitan in India, and should have as such all such jurisdiction as the Crown should by Letters-Patent direct, subject, nevertheless, to the general superintendence and revision of the Archbishop of Canterbury; and it was provided that the Bishops of Madras and Bombay should be subject to the Bishop of Calcutta as Metropolitan, and should take an oath of canonical obedience to him.

So again, when in 1824 a Bishop was appointed in Jamaica by Letters-Patent containing clauses similar to those which are found in the Letters-Patent to the present Appellant, it was thought necessary that the legal status and authority of the Bishop should be confirmed and established by an Act of the Colonial Legislature. The consent of the Crown was given to this Colonial Act, which would have been an improper thing, as an injury to the Crown's Prerogative, unless the Law Advisers of the Government had been satisfied that the Colonial Statute was necessary to give full effect to the establishment of the Bishopric.

The conclusion is further confirmed by observing the course of Imperial legislation on the same subject, namely, the creation of new Bishoprics in England.

When four new Bishoprics were constituted by Henry VIII. it appears to have been thought necessary, even by that absolute Monarch, to have recourse to the authority of Parliament, and the Act that was passed (viz. the 31 Henry VIII. cap. 9, which is not found in the ordinary edition) is of a singular character. After referring to the slothful and ungodly life which had been used among all those which bore the name of religious folk, and reciting that it was thought, therefore, unto the King's Highness most expedient and necessary that more Bishoprics, Collegiate and Cathedral Churches should be established, it was enacted that His Highness should have full power and authority from time to time to declare and nominate by his Letters-Patent or other writing to be made under his Great Seal, such number of Bishops, such number of Cities, Sees for Bishops, Cathedral Churches and Dioceses by metes and bounds, for the exercise and ministration of their episcopal offices and administration as shall appertain, and to endow them with such possessions after such manner, form, and condition as to his most excellent wisdom shall be thought necessary and convenient.

This Statute, which was repealed by the 1st and 2nd of Philip and Mary, cap. 8, sec. 18, does not appear to have been revived. It is remarkable as granting power to nominate and appoint new Bishops as well as to create new Sees and Dioceses.

So also in recent times the two new Bishoprics of Manchester and Ripon were constituted, and the new Bishops received ecclesiastical jurisdiction, under the authority of an Act of Parliament. It is true that it has been the practice, for many years, to insert in Letters-Patent creating Colonial Bishoprics clauses which purport to confer ecclesiastical jurisdiction ; but the forms of such Letters-Patent were probably taken by the official persons who prepared them from the original forms used in the Letters-Patent appointing the East Indian Bishops, without adverting to the fact that such last-mentioned Letters-Patent were granted under the provisions of an Act of Parliament.

We therefore arrive at the conclusion that although in a Crown Colony, properly so called, or in cases where the Letters-Patent are made in pursuance of the authority of an Act of Parliament (such for example as the Act of 6 and 7 Vict., cap. 13), a Bishopric may be constituted and ecclesiastical jurisdiction conferred by the sole authority of the Crown, yet that the Letters-Patent of the Crown will not have any such effect or operation in a Colony or Settlement which is possessed of an independent legislature.

The subject was considered by the Judicial Committee in the case of Long *v.* the Bishop of Cape Town, and we adhere to the principles which are there laid down.

The same reasoning is of course decisive of the second question, whether any jurisdiction was conferred by the Letters-Patent. Let it be granted or assumed that the Letters-Patent are sufficient in law to confer on Dr. Gray the ecclesiastical status of Metropolitan, and to create between him and the Bishops of Natal and Graham's Town the personal relation of Metropolitan and Suffragan as ecclesiastics, yet it is quite clear that the Crown had no power to confer any jurisdiction or coercive legal authority upon the Metropolitan over the Suffragan Bishops, or over any other person.

It is a settled constitutional principle or rule of law, that although the Crown may by its Prerogative establish Courts to proceed according to the Common Law, yet that it cannot create any new Court to administer any other law ; and it is laid down by Lord Coke in the 4th Institute that the erection of a new Court with a new jurisdiction cannot be without an Act of Parliament.

It cannot be said that any ecclesiastical tribunal or jurisdiction is required in any Colony or Settlement where there is no Established Church, and in the case of a settled Colony the Ecclesiastical Law of England cannot, for the same reason, be treated as part of the law which the settlers carried with them from the mother country.

So much of the Letters-Patent now in question as attempts to confer any coercive legal jurisdiction is also in violation of the law as declared and established by that part of the Act of the 16 Car. I. c. 11, which remains unrepealed by the 13 Car. II. st. 2, c. 12. It may be useful to state this in detail. By the 16th and 17th sections of the 1 Eliz. c. 1, entitled "An Act for restoring to the Crown the ancient Jurisdiction over the State Eccesiastical and Spiritual, and abolishing all Foreign Power repugnant to the same," it was enacted that all usurped and foreign power and authority,

spiritual and temporal, should for ever be extinguished within the Realm, and that such jurisdictions, privileges, superiorities, and pre-eminences, spiritual and ecclesiastical, as by any spiritual or ecclesiastical power or authority had theretofore been or might lawfully be exercised or used for the visitation of the ecclesiastical state and persons, and for reformation, order, and correction of the same, and of all manner of heresies, schisms, abuses, offences, contempts, and enormities, should for ever be united and annexed to the Imperial Crown of this realm. And by the 18th section the Queen was empowered by Letters-Patent to appoint persons to exercise, occupy, use, and execute all manner of spiritual or ecclesiastical jurisdiction within the realms of England and Ireland, or any other the dominions and countries of the Crown.

Under this Statute the High Commission Court was erected, which was abolished by the 16 Car. I. c. 10.

By the Act of the 16 Car. I. c. 11, the 18th section of the 1 Eliz. c. 1, was wholly repealed, and by the 4th section of the same Statute all spiritual and ecclesiastical persons or judges were forbidden under severe penalties to exercise any jurisdiction or coercive legal authority, an enactment which closed all the regular established ecclesiastical tribunals; but by the 13 Car. II. c. 12, the ordinary ecclesiastical jurisdiction and authority, as it existed before the year 1639, was with certain savings restored to the Archbishops and Bishops; and the Act of the 16 Car. I. excepting what concerned the High Commission Court or the erection of any such like Court by Commission was repealed, but with a proviso that nothing should extend or be construed to revive or give force to the enactments contained in the 18th section of the 1 Eliz. c. 1, which should remain and stand repealed.

There is therefore no power in the Crown to create any new or additional ecclesiastical tribunal or jurisdiction, and the clauses which purport to do so, contained in the Letters-Patent to the Appellant and Respondent, are simply void in law. No Metropolitan or Bishop in any Colony having legislative institutions can, by virtue of the Crown's Letters-Patent alone (unless granted under an Act of Parliament, or confirmed by a Colonial Statute), exercise any coercive jurisdiction, or hold any Court or Tribunal for that purpose.

Pastoral or spiritual authority may be incidental to the office of Bishop, but all jurisdiction in the Church, where it can be lawfully conferred, must proceed from the Crown, and be exercised as the law directs, and suspension or privation of office is matter of coercive legal jurisdiction, and not of mere spiritual authority.

3. If, then, the Bishop of Cape Town had no jurisdiction by law, did he obtain any by contract or submission on the part of the Bishop of Natal?

There is nothing on which such an argument can be attempted to be put, unless it be the oath of canonical obedience taken by the Bishop of Natal to Dr. Gray as Metropolitan.

The argument must be, that both parties being aware that the Bishop

of Cape Town had no jurisdiction or legal authority as Metropolitan, the Appellant agreed to give it to him by voluntary submission.

But even if the parties intended to enter into any such agreement (of which, however, we find no trace), it was not legally competent to the Bishop of Natal to give, or to the Bishop of Cape Town to accept or exercise, any such jurisdiction.

There remains one point to be considered. It was contended before us that if the Bishop of Cape Town had no jurisdiction, his judgment was a nullity, and that no appeal could lie from a nullity to Her Majesty in Council.

But that is by no means the consequence of holding that the Respondent had no jurisdiction. The Bishop of Cape Town, acting under the authority which the Queen's Letters-Patent purported to give, asserts that he has held a Court of Justice, and that with certain legal forms he has pronounced a judicial sentence, and that by such sentence he has deposed the Bishop of Natal from his office of Bishop, and deprived him of his See. He also asserts that the sentence having been published in the Diocese of Natal, the clergy and inhabitants of that diocese are thereby deprived of all Episcopal superintendence. Whether these proceedings have the effect which is attributed to them by the Bishop of Cape Town, is a question of the greatest importance, and one which we feel bound to decide. We have already shown that there was no power to confer any jurisdiction on the Respondent as Metropolitan. The attempt to give Appellate jurisdiction to the Archbishop of Canterbury is equally invalid.

This important question can be decided only by the Sovereign as Head of the Established Church and depository of the ultimate Appellate jurisdiction.

Before the Reformation, in a dispute of this nature between two independent prelates, an appeal would have lain to the Pope; but all appellate authority of the Pope over members of the Established Church is by Statute vested in the Crown.

It is the settled prerogative of the Crown to receive Appeals in all Colonial causes, and by the 25 Henry VIII. c. 19 (by which the mode of the Appeal to the Crown in Ecclesiastical Causes is directed) it is by the 4th section enacted that "for lack of justice at or in any of the Courts of the Archbishops of this Realm, *or in any of the King's dominions*, it shall be lawful to the parties grieved to appeal to the King's Majesty in the Court of Chancery," an enactment which gave rise to the Commission of Delegates, for which this Tribunal is now substituted.

Unless a controversy, such as that which is presented by this Appeal and Petition, falls to be determined by the ultimate jurisdiction of the Crown, it is plain that there would be a denial of justice, and no remedy for great public inconvenience and mischief. It is right to add, although unnecessary, that by the Act 3 and 4 Wm. IV. cap. 41, which constituted this Tribunal, Her Majesty has power to refer to the Judicial Committee for hearing or consideration any such other matters whatsoever as Her Majesty shall think fit, and this Committee is thereupon to hear or

consider the same, and to advise Her Majesty thereon; and that on the 10th June, 1864, it was ordered by Her Majesty in Council that the Petition and Supplemental Petition of the Appellant should be, and the same were, thereby referred to this Committee, to hear the same and report their opinion thereupon to Her Majesty.

Their Lordships therefore will humbly report to Her Majesty their judgment and opinion that the proceedings taken by the Bishop of Cape Town, and the judgment or sentence pronounced by him against the Bishop of Natal, are null and void in law.

Appendix IX.—Vol. II. p. 365.

To His Grace Charles Thomas, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England and Metropolitan, etc.

Whereas, at this present time, imputations of disloyalty to the Church of England are current, to the discredit of those who have been, many of them for years, inculcating and defending the doctrines of the real objective presence, of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and of the adoration of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament, and whereas, by reason of these imputations, the minds of many are troubled: we, therefore, the undersigned, exercising the office of the priesthood within the Church of England, beg respectfully to state to your Grace, and through your Grace, to our Right Rev. Fathers in God, the Bishops of your Province, and to the Church at large, what we believe to be the mind of our Lord touching the said doctrines, as expressed in Holy Scripture, and as received by the Church of England, in conformity with the teaching of the Catholic Church in those ages, to which the Church of England directs us as "most pure and uncorrupt," and of "the old godly doctors," to whom she has in many ways referred us; declaring hereby both what we repudiate, and what we believe, touching the said doctrines.

1. We repudiate the opinion of a "corporal presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood," that is to say, of the presence of His Body's Blood, as they "are in heaven," and the conception of the mode of His presence, which implies the physical change of the natural substances of the Bread and Wine, commonly called "Transubstantiation." We believe that, in the Holy Eucharist, by virtue of the consecration, through the power of the Holy Ghost, the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ, "the inward part, or thing signified," are present really and truly, but spiritually and ineffably, under "the outward visible part or sign," or "form of bread and wine."

2. We repudiate the notion of any fresh sacrifice or any view of the Eucharistic sacrificial offering as of something apart from the One All-Sufficient Sacrifice and Oblation on the Cross, which alone "is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual, and which alone is "meritorious."

We believe that, as in Heaven, Christ, our great High Priest, ever

offers Himself before the Eternal Father, pleading by His presence His sacrifice of Himself once offered on the Cross; so on earth, in the Holy Eucharist, that same Body once for all sacrificed for us, and that same Blood once for all shed for us, sacramentally present, are offered and pleaded before the Father by the Priest as our Lord ordained to be done in remembrance of Himself, when He instituted the Blessed Sacrament of His Body and Blood.

3. We repudiate all "adoration" of "the sacramental bread and wine," which would be "idolatry;" regarding them with reverence due to them because of their sacramental relation to the Body and Blood of our Lord:—we repudiate also all adoration of "a corporal presence of Christ's Natural Flesh and Blood;" that is to say, of the presence of His Body and Blood, as they "are in Heaven." We believe that Christ Himself, really and truly, but spiritually and ineffably, present in the sacrament, is therein to be adored.

Furthermore, in so far as any of the undersigned, repudiating and believing as hereinbefore stated, have used, in whatever degree, a ritual beyond what had become common in our churches, we desire to state that we have done so, not as wishing to introduce a system of worship foreign to the Church of England, but as believing that, in so doing, we act in harmony with the principles and the law of the Church of England, and as using that liberty which has in such matters been always allowed to her Clergy and her people; having at heart the promotion of the glory of God in the due and reverent celebration of the Holy Eucharist as the central act of Divine worship. In making the above statement we desire expressly to guard ourselves against being supposed to put it forth as any new exposition of the faith, nor do we seek to elicit from your Grace, or from our Right Rev. Fathers in God, the Bishops of your Province, any declaration in regard to the subjects upon which we have here stated our belief: we wish only thus publicly to make known this our profession of faith, for the quieting of the minds of others, and for the satisfaction of our own consciences.

Butler, W., Vicar of Wantage.
Carter, T. T., Rector of Clewer.
Chamberlain, T., Vicar of S. Thomas the Martyr, Oxford.
Chambers, T. C., Perpetual Curate of S. Mary's, Crown Street, Soho.
Courtenay, C. L., Vicar of Bovey Tracy, and Canon of S. George's, Windsor.
Denison, G. A., Vicar of East Brent, Archdeacon of Taunton.
Grueber, C. S., Incumbent of S. James the Less, Hambridge.
Liddell, R., Perpetual Curate of S. Paul's, Knightsbridge.
Liddon, H. P., student of Christ Church, Prebendary of Salisbury.

LITTLEDALE, R. E., LL.D., D.C.L., Priest of Diocese of London.
MACKONOCHIE, A. H., Perpetual Curate of S. Alban's, Holborn.
MAYOW, W. M., Perpetual Curate of S. Mary's, West Brompton.
MEDD, P. G., Fellow and Tutor of University College, and Curate of S. John Baptist, Oxford.
MURRAY, F. H., Rector of Chislehurst.
PERRY, T. W., Curate of S. Michael and All Angels, Brighton.
PUSEY, E. B., D.D., Professor of Hebrew, Canon of Christ Church.
RICHARDS, W. U., Incumbent of All Saints, Margaret Street.
SKINNER, J., Vicar of Newland, Great Malvern.
WARD, W. PERCEVAL, Rector of Compton Valence.
WHITE, G. C., Perpetual Curate of S. Barnabas, Pimlico.
WILLIAMS, G., Senior Fellow of King's College, Cambridge.

APPENDIX X.—Vol. II. p. 447.

RULES for the MISSIONARY ASSOCIATION OF LADIES for the DIOCESE OF CAPE TOWN.

This Association shall be under the immediate direction and superintendence of the Dean of Cape Town, who will appoint to the ladies their several spheres and work, and regulate their whole manner of living and proceeding.

The Bishop of the Diocese will be Visitor, and, should occasion arise, there will be an appeal to him.

In matters of domestic arrangement, one lady will be appointed to act as Superior over the others, and will be entitled to enforce obedience to the Rules made for the comfort and well-being of the house. The Superior will be appointed for one year, and by the Bishop.

No lady can be accepted for the work unless she is of fair health, has sufficient means for her maintenance, and is willing to devote herself and her means to the service of God, and give herself to the work of the Church in South Africa with thorough heartiness and zeal.

The ladies of this Association shall be considered as connected with the Cathedral Church of Cape Town, and it shall be a part of their duty, when possible, to attend its daily services, and to be present regularly at celebrations of the Holy Communion.

The admission of new members into the community, and the conditions of their admission, shall be at the discretion of the Dean and the Superior, with the consent of the Bishop.

As no such Society as that contemplated can prosper unless its fixed Rules are conscientiously observed, every newly-admitted member shall,

within a month after her admission, make a promise of obedience to the Rules, in a form approved by the Visitor ; but such promise is not intended to bind the members on their part to remain any definite period in the house, or the Dean or Superior, on their part, to allow her to remain a permanent member of the Association.

A member of the community will be free to depart, if any claim of duty, which to her own conscience appears to be more binding, should occur, such reasonable notice of her intention having been previously given as may be possible under the circumstances. The engagement may likewise be broken off by common consent between the Associate on her part, and the Dean and Superior on the other.

When a member has been formally admitted, she cannot be removed, except for some grave cause, to be determined by the concurrent judgment of the Dean and Superior, nor until such decision shall have been approved by the Visitor.

Each Associate is expected to contribute towards the maintenance of the house, if she possess the means, and according to her means.

As an ordinary Rule, the sum of £50 per annum is required, but this sum may be reduced or altogether remitted, according to circumstances.

The pecuniary arrangements made with each member shall not be made known to the other members, as all should live together on equal terms of respect and love, without any difference or partiality, for she who offers herself, offers her best gift.

Those who are possessed of means beyond what is required for their maintenance in the house, will retain the control of it ; but it must not be so expended within the house as to make any distinction between the rich and poor. All will rank alike, and whatever is in use at the public table or in the community room will be free alike to all.

The Superior shall have the oversight and control of the entire household, exercising whatever authority may be needful for the orderly management of the family and the observance of the Rules, whilst acting as an elder sister among her fellow-labourers.

It will be her duty to check censorious remarks, personal or uncharitable observations, and controversial discussions, or other conversation injurious to the general tone, should occasion call for her interference. It will also be her duty to refer anything that may go wrong in the house to the Dean, for his judgment and counsel thereon.

She will have the direction of the servants, and the care of providing for the table, and other domestic arrangements. If any fault is to be found with the food provided, or any other matter in this department, complaint should be made to the Superior in private, never in public.

All the members shall have free access to the Dean, seeing him when he visits the house, if desired, alone.

The ladies will have a common sitting-room, but, as soon as circumstances admit of it, will each be provided with a separate bed-room.

The furniture and other articles in the dwelling and sleeping rooms, as well as the dress of the members, shall be such as is consistent with a

true religious simplicity. The dress will be that which has already been decided upon, and no alteration can be made in this without reference to the Bishop.

During the residence of any lady in the house, the contributions of furniture, plate, linen, etc., brought by her, will be considered common stock, and used for the benefit of the whole community generally ; but when she leaves she will be at liberty to take with her the articles brought by her.

The members will be free to choose books for their private reading and devotion, in confidence that they will choose such only as accord with the spirit of the work in which they are engaged, and the teaching of that branch of the Church in which they were baptized. The Dean, though not needlessly interfering, is bound to exercise his own discretion to prevent the use of any books or habits of devotion which may seem to him inconsistent with such principles.

Every Friday evening a special service of prayer shall be held by the members for a blessing on the work in which they are engaged. One hour, at least, in every day shall be set apart by the Superior for private devotion and religious study for the members, independent of their morning and evening devotions.

The members shall also, if possible, have set apart for retirement a portion of one day in every three months, in order to review what has been done amiss, and to quicken their resolutions for the future.

The hours of prayer in the house will be in some degree regulated by the hours of prayer in the Cathedral. For the present, prayers appointed by the Bishop will be read by the Superior (in the absence of a Clergyman), or by one of the ladies in her absence, at 9 a.m., at noon, and 9.30 p.m. The inmates of the house are not under an *obligation* to attend all these services, though it is expected that they will not absent themselves without sufficient cause.

All, unless staying away from the house, should be present at the last evening prayer in the Oratory. The Oratory will always be open for private prayer.

As it is expedient that the day should begin and close with devotion, the members shall retire at once, and silently, to their own rooms, after evening prayer, except with the express permission of the Superior, or for some necessary duty.

The temporary absence of the members, and the duration of such absence, must be previously notified to, and approved by, the Superior. The members shall have free intercourse with their relations, male or female, who may visit them at any time ; but the visits of other friends, and the time of such visits, must be previously approved of by the Superior.

The hours for work in or out of the house, and for meals, etc., will be appointed by the Superior, with the approbation of the Dean. The nature of the work out of doors to be entirely under the Dean.

Silence is to be observed in going to and from the Oratory and the Church, while within the Church gates, so far as is consistent with ordinary

courtesy in returning salutations offered; and from after the last prayers in the Oratory until after the early Cathedral service, except to say good night or good morning. The hours from 10.30 to 12 a.m., and from 3 to 5 p.m., shall also be considered working hours, when those engaged in the house will abstain from all conversation, except such as shall be required for, and strictly concerning, the work they are engaged in.

The fasts of the Church will be observed; but the members cannot be allowed to *fast* beyond what the Dean may sanction and the medical attendant approve. All experience having shown that ladies engaged in much bodily work cannot *fast* without injury to health, fasting will not be ordinarily allowed to those engaged in work, but only abstinence from delicacies, and from things not absolutely necessary.

These Rules can only be amended or added to by the Dean, and in every case must have the sanction of the Visitor.

INDEX.

A

Adam Kok, 281
Addresses of Clergy in Natal question, ii. 56
African 'Black Country,' 302
Ainger, death of Miss, ii. 2
Alban's, S., Holborn, ii. 333
Alexis of Russia, Grand Duke, ii. 547, 566
Alfred, Prince, 462, 463
Alverstoke, 137
American Church, 78, ii. 245; Bishops, 342
American Missions, 289
Amusements, how far lawful for the Clergy, ii. 220
Andrew's, S., Wells Street, ii. 371-2
Anglo-African newspaper, ii. 247
Animals, Bishop Gray's love of, 276
Anti-convict agitation, 233, 255
Appeal in Long Case, 512
Archbishop of Canterbury, letter to, concerning appearing before Privy Council, ii. 181; American Bishops, ii. 198
Archbishop of Canterbury—letter to the Dean of Maritzburg, ii. 236; to Bishop Colenso, 245; to Rev. W. Butler, 299, 304; concerning Rev. W. K. Macrorie, 393
Armstrong, Bishop, 370; arrival in Africa, 382; death of, 403
Articles of Accusation, Bishop of Natal, ii. 75
Association for Natal, ii. 434
Athanasian Creed, ii. 559, 560, 565
Augustine's, S., 434, ii. 425

B

Badnall, Archdeacon, speech in Bishop of Natal's trial, ii. 86
Ball, the Bishop at a, 235
Barbados, voyage to, 5
Bath, 138
Benson, Father, letter from, ii. 554
Bishops, English, meeting concerning Colenso case, ii. 27, 32; protest addressed to Bishop Colenso, 51
Blachford, Lord, letter from, ii. 326
Blakesley's, Canon, amendment, ii. 399
Bloemfontein, 185, 270, 281; Bishop of, ii. 509, 524
Blomfield, Bishop, 134
Boers, outbreak of, 185
Bombay, Bishopric of, ii. 423, 437
Bournemouth, ii. 381
Bradfield, 357; sends his son to, 375, 434
Brereton, Colonel, 2, 3
Bridge's Christian Ministry, 57
Bristol, Riots in, 2, 3, 20
Brotherhoods, need of, ii. 548
Brussels, visit to, 369
Buckingham, Duke of, ii. 414, 418, 420, 433, 442, 461
Burghersdorp, 318
Bushmen, the, 286
Butler, Rev. William, elected Bishop of Natal, ii. 297; letters to, *ibid.* 299, 301, 302, 363, 365, 367, 369
Butler, Rev. W., letter to 'Guardian', ii. 367
Byer's Green, 39, 41, 64

C

Caledon, 191
Cambridge, 137, 438, ii. 373
Candlesticks, lawful, ii. 533
Canonry, Honorary, in Durham, 93
Cape Colony, 115; history of, 154
Cape Diocese, peculiarity of, 213
Cape Town proffered, 109; accepted, 113

Carnarvon, Lord, 438, ii. 286, 432
Carter, Rev. T. T., Spiritual instructions, ii. 457
Catechising, ii. 319
Catechists, 235
Chalice, mixed, ii. 535
Charles X., 11
Chichester, 137
Church principles, 77
Clewer, works at, ii. 382
Cole, Miss, letters to, 129, 134, 161, 335, 371, 396, ii. 463
Collegiate School, 210, 239, 347
Colenso, Dr., appointment to Natal, 371; case, beginning of, ii. 18; trial, 74; citation, 75; protest, 76; sentence served, 137; Bishop Colenso's appeal, 147; return to Africa, 237; Metropolitan's letter to before excommunicating, 240; Committee of Convocation to inquire into deposition, 403; report, 425
Colonial Bishopric proposed, 100; Colonial Bishops' Committee, 122, ii. 379
Colonial Church Bill, 363; Bishops, meeting of, ii. 342-3
Conceit, ii. 458
Conference, Diocesan, in Natal, ii. 144; of Clergy and Laity to elect a Bishop, 295; Lambeth, 373
Confession, ii. 454, 457, 458, 530
Confirmation on board ship, 231
Consecration, 127; of Bishop Macrorie, ii. 464
Constitution of the African Church, ii. 489
Convocation, need for, 336
Cotterill, Bishop, appointment, 409; departure for Edinburgh, ii. 524
Coutts', Miss Burdett, petition, ii. 263, 279
Cowley Fathers, ii. 553
Cox, Rev. F. H., ii., 259
Crossgate, offer of, 65
Cross, lawful in churches, ii. 533
Crozier, presentation of, ii. 358
Cuddesden, 357; ordination at, 365; Theological college, ii. 65, 69, 116, 382, 422
Cyprian's, S., ii. 372

D

Davis, Mr., "the George Herbert of the Forest," ii. 380
Deacon's Orders, 30
Deceased Wife's Sister question, 373
Declaration, Church, 248; of the Clergy, 311
Declaration of Fundamental Principles, ii. 488
Degree, M.A., 33; D.D., 124
Despatch, Duke of Buckingham's, ii. 414, 416, 420
Diocesan Library, 421; Hymn Book, 453
Douglas, Dean of Cape Town, 395-6; speech in Bishop of Natal's trial, ii. 77; appointment to Bombay, 423
Douglas, Rev. Hon. H., 169, 188, 275; letter to 'Guardian,' ii. 280; Commissary to the Metropolitan, 287
Drakenberg, the, 284
Duff, Dr. Alexander, ii. 119, 145
Durham, Bishop of, 81, 91, 96, 98, 107, 116, 118
Durham, Honorary Canonry in, 93
Dutch Reformed, 159, ii. 462, 544

E

East Grinstead, visit to, 442
Ecclesiastical Courts Bill, 420
Ecclesiastical history, ii. 219
Edinburgh, Coadjutor Bishop of, ii. 385, 392
Ekukanyeni, ii. 141
Elberfeldt, 444
Ely, visit to, ii. 362
Ely, Dean of, amendment, ii. 399
—— Bishop of, ii. 429
England, first return to, 354; second return, 428; last return to, ii. 503
English Church Union, ii. 434
Erle, Archdeacon, ii. 410
Essays and Reviews, 532, ii. 113, 153
Eucharist, Holy, opinions on, ii. 531; elevation of, 535
Eucharistic adoration, ii. 534
Excommunication, sentence of, on Dr. Colenso, ii. 248; Bishop Wilberforce on, 401
Exeter, 138; Bishop of 138, ii. 33, 392, 397

F

Faure, Mr., 159, 164
Fort Peddie, 199
Freeman, Archdeacon, ii. 393
Free State Bishopric, ii. 7, 8
Funchal, 145

G

Geneva, 18
George, 254, 322 ; proposed See of, ii. 505
George's, S., Community, ii. 444 ; opening of Oratory, 447 ; Rule of Life, 449 ; work of 461 ; new house, 478
Germany, visit to, 644
Gibbon, 19
Gibraltar, Bishop of, motion, ii. 342
Gladstone, State and Church, 69 ; conversation with, 359, ii. 468
Glover, Rev. E., 422 ; death of Mrs., ii. 484
Graham's Town, visit to, on the Bishop's death, 406
Graaf Reinet, 204
Gray, Mrs., death of, ii. 516
Gray, the Bishop of Bristol, 1, 30 ; death, 33
—— Fanny, illness and death, 5, 9
—— Thomas, 12
—— Augustus, death of, 12
—— Harriet, death of, 26
—— Charles, of Godmanchester, 30 ; death of, 387 ; death of Mrs. Charles, ii. 9
—— William, letters to, 165
—— Henry, death of, ii. 160
Green, Dean, ii. 435
Grey, Lord, 116, 134, 339, 359
Grey, Sir George, 385, 396, 447, ii. 5

H

Hawkins Mr. Ernest, 100, 107, 112, 115, 117 ; Letters to, 167, 239, 271.
Hedingham Castle, ii. 423
Helena, S., first visitation of, 219 ; scenery, 223 ; state of, 224 ; work in, 227 ; second visit to, 352 ; proposed Bishopric, 429 ; appointment of Bishop Claughton, 440 ; visit in 1867, ii. 323
Helmsley Vicarage, ii. 491
Highnam Court, ii. 380
Hope Beresford, Mr., speech at Wolverhampton, ii. 358
Horbury, 435
Houghton, Lord, ii. 433
House of Lords, ii. 432
How Walsham, Mr., Natal offered to, ii. 371
Howley, Archbishop, 111, 114, 117
Hughenden, offer of, 41
Hursley, 443
Hymns Ancient and Modern, ii. 182

I

Ilam, visit to, ii. 420
Illinois, Bishop of, ii. 370
Illness, severe, 181 ; inflammation of the eyes, 362, 367
Imitation, the, 461, ii. 189, 507, 508
Indianism, 249, 342
Irish Church, ii. 474
Italian sermons, 24
Italy, tour in, 13-29

J

James's, S., Hall, conversazione in, ii. 355
John's, S., Cambridge, ii. 373
Judgment of Supreme Court in Long Case, 507 ; of Privy Council, 513
—— of Metropolitan in Bishop of Natal's Trial, ii. 91
—— of the Judicial Committee *in re* Colenso, ii. 189
—— of the Master of the Rolls in Colenso *v.* Gladstone, etc., ii. 304

K

Kafirs, 297
Kafir Chiefs, meeting of, 197
Kafir war, 325, 326, 336
Kafir Institution, 448, 450, 456, ii. 1
Kaffraria, British, Mission in, 266, 272
Karroo, the, 205, ii. 227
Keble, Rev. John, gift of library, 421 ; visit to, 443 ; letters from, 533, ii. 121, 126, 128, 133, 165, 174 ; letters to, 110, 125, 127, 132, 164, 173, 204, 208, 254 ; death of, ii. 260
—— Rev. Thomas, letter to, ii. 260, 438

Kei River, 304
Kempis, Thomas à, 461, ii. 189
Kidderminster, parish of, ii. 187
Knysna, the, 168, ii. 471

L

Lancing, ii. 421
Lambeth Conference, ii. 373
Lausanne, 12, 16
Lawrence, S., Jewry, services at, ii. 343, 413, 441
'Lessons,' ii. 329
512
Letter to Churchwardens of Mowbray, *in re* Long Case, 519
—— to Bishop Colenso, ii. 28
—— concerning Master of Rolls' Judgment, ii. 307, 309
—— to Bishop of London, ii. 386
—— to Archbishop of York, ii. 390
—— to Archbishop of Canterbury, ii. 394, 406
—— to Bishop of Ripon, ii. 396
Lichfield, Bishop, ii. 429
Liddon, Rev. H. P., ii. 414, 422
Livingstone, Dr., 450, ii. 2
Llandaff, Bishop of, ii. 428
Long, beginning of case, 472; suspension, 476; trial, 477, 497; appeal, 512.
Longley, Archbishop, death of, ii. 463
London, Bishop of, letters to the 'Times,' ii. 356, 384, 428
Longwood, 223
Lower House of Convocation, debate on Bishop Colenso, ii. 53, 274, 397, 431
Lucy's, S., Gloucester, ii. 380

M

Mackenzie, Archdeacon, 462; arrival at Cape Town, 468; consecration of, 469; work, ii. 4; death of, 9
Mackenzie, Miss, letters to, ii. 494
Macrorie, Rev. W. K., proposed for See of Natal, ii. 380; accepts, 382; income for, 383; difficulties about consecration, 385, 413, 416, 424, 438; consecration, 474
Madagascar Bishopric, ii. 404
Madeira, island of, 143; Church disputes in, 145, 152, ii. 445
Magee, Dr., Dean of Cork, ii. 335
Mahometans, 177-8, 237
Marriage, 53; question of, 323; of the Bishop's eldest daughter, 422, 427
Melitzani, the Chief, 282
Merriman, Rev. N., 173; Archdeacon, 210, 244, 250, 269, 273; speech in Bishop of Natal's trial, ii. 85; consecration of, to Graham's Town, 542
Michael's, S., Shoreditch, ii. 332
Milan, 20
Missionary Bishops, 441, 468, ii. 17; for Zululand, 371, 416
Mission, Central African, 442, 467; letter to, ii. 15
Mission, Oxford, 429
Mission to the Kafirs, 266, 268
Missionary work in the North, 74
Monmouth, E. C. U. deputation, ii. 370
Moravian Institutions, 192, 269
Myddleton, the family of, 49; death of Mrs., 440

N

Namaqua Land, 262, 539
Naples, 23
Natal, proposal to create a Diocese, 333, 362; first troubles in, 395, 433; considered by English Bishops, ii. 27; in Convocation, Lower House, 52; Upper, 54; presentment of Bishop, 61; trial, 71; citation, 71; sentence served, 137; question in Pan-Anglican Synod, 348; report discussed in Pan-Anglican Synod, 374; return to Maritzburg, 237; protest of Churchwardens, 239
Nelson, Lord, ii. 434

O

Offer of Cape Town, 112
Old Park, 49
Ordination of the Bishop's son, ii. 172
Oxford circular for Cape Town, ii. 157, 294
Oxford, visits to, ii. 411
—— Bishop of, letters from, ii. 430, 440

P

Pakington, Sir John, 364
Paley, Dr., ordination sermon, 71
Palmer, Sir R., consultation with, ii. 418
Pan-Anglican Synod, ii. 321, 330; preliminary meeting, 337; opening address, 345; declaration, 346; Pastoral, 351
Paris, 11, 14
Pastoral Letter, 258, 344, 410; Provincial, to Church of Natal, ii. 106, 249
Philarete, Metropolitan, death of, ii. 375
Phillimore, Dr., opinion in Colenso case, ii. 70
Pieter Maritzburg, 287; letter to the Governor of, 291
Politics, 57
Polygamy, 395
Port Elizabeth, 194, 317
Port Nolloth, illness at, ii. 541
Prætorius, 185
Presentment of Bishop of Natal, ii. 55, 61
Priest's Orders, 32
Primus of Scotland on the Pan-Anglican Conference, ii. 357, 375, 383, 393
Protea, 156, 159, 160; purchase of, 338
Protest of Bishop of Natal, ii. 76
Pusey, Dr., 78, 358; letter to 'Churchman,' ii. 196, 411, 416

Q

Queen Adelaide, 144, 146
Question of precedence, 246

R

Record newspaper, ii. 318
Report of Pan-Anglican Committee on Natal question, ii. 376.
Resolutions of Natal clergy, ii. 209.
Reunion of Churches, ii. 544
Ritualism, ii. 320, 333, 413, 527
Rochester, Bishop of, ii. 441
Rodriguez on Christian perfection, 17
Rome, visit to, 22, 28
Ross, Sir Patrick, 221; his death, 352

S

Salisbury, 11, 131, 439; meeting at, ii. 334, 435
—— Bishop of, ii. 429
S. Saviour's Fields, consecration of, 86
Selwyn, Bishop, appointed to Lichfield, ii. 371
Scudamore, Rev. H. C., death, ii. 59
Sentence of Bishop of Natal, ii. 105; served, 137; published in Natal, 139
Seymour's, Canon, *Gravamen*, ii. 397
Shepton Beauchamp, ii. 393
Sicily, 27
Sisterhoods, need of, 268
Slavery, 225; a slave ship, 226
Smith, Sir Harry, 158, 161, 166, 232, 239, 256, 339
Speeches, Bishop Gray's, in Long case, 478, 497
Spiritual Combat, 17
Spiritual letters, ii. 454
'Statement,' a, ii. 289, 292
Stockton, offer of, 81; appointment of a successor, 119; visit to, 441
Stoles, coloured, legal, ii. 537
Sunday, observance of, 460
Super altar, legal, ii. 533
Switzerland, journey to, 11
Synod, 186, 341, 418, ii. 486

T

Table Mountain, 179
Tennessee, Bishop of, ii. 359
Thomas, Archdeacon, ii. 439
Tozer's, Bishop, consecration, ii. 17; arrival in Africa, 55; plans, 379
Tracts for the Times, 68
Trial of Bishop of Natal, ii. 70
Tristan d'Acunha, visit to, 398
Tudhoe, 41
Twells, Bishop, consecration, ii. 17

U

Umgeni River, 290
Umhalla, the chief, 266; visit to, 306, 407
Upper House of Convocation, debate on Bishop Colenso, ii. 53, 211, 264, 400

V

Venice, 21
Vestments, ii. 533
Visitation Charge, 472; in Natal, ii. 142
Visitation, first, 184; Journal, 190; second, 251; in Natal, 266; third, 391; to Clanwilliam, 424, 449, 458, 463, ii. 58, 66, 117; in Natal after Bishop Colenso's deposition, 139; of (1865), 226; (1866) 290; (1869), 466, 479
Visitation, last, ii. 558
Voltaire, 19
Voyage, first, to Cape Town, 141
Voyage, last, home, ii. 513

W

Wantage, ii. 380
Watermeyer's, Mr. Judge, speech in Long Case, ii. 185; death of, 326
Webb, Bishop, consecration of, ii. 509
Welby, Archdeacon, 325; appointed to S. Helena, ii. 7
Wellington, Duke of, 360
Well-dressing, ii. 420
Westminster, Dean of, speech in Convocation, ii. 213, 274, 431
Wetheral, Sir Charles, 2
Weymouth, residence at, 32
Whickham, offer of, 96
Whitworth, presentation to, 33
Wilberforce, Archdeacon, 383
Williamson, Dr., letter from, on accepting a Bishopric, 103, 110; death of, ii. 230
Wilkinson, Bishop, consecration of, ii. 498
Wilson and Williams' Case, 532
Wolverhampton, Church Congress at, ii. 357
Woodlands, purchase of, for College School, 246
Wymering, ii. 333

Y

Yarmouth, 432
York, Archbishop of, letters, ii. 385
York, Dean of, ii. 413

Z

Zambesi Mission, 469, ii. 2, 59, 116
Zealand, New, Bishop of, ii. 344
Zonnebloem, 449
Zululand Diocese, ii. 494
Zulu Mission, 356

THE END.

Printed by R. & R. Clark, *Edinburgh.*